

OFFICIAL FEEDBACK FORM

DIALOGUE DATE	Monday, 9 August 2021 09:00 GMT -03:00
DIALOGUE TITLE	Defesa de sistemas agroalimentares: raízes, territórios e caminhos na Amazônia, Cerrado e Nordeste do Brasil
CONVENED BY	Brian Garvey, University of Strathclyde; Maria Luisa Mendonca, Rede Social de Justiça e Direitos Humanos
DIALOGUE EVENT PAGE	https://summitdialogues.org/dialogue/20837/
DIALOGUE TYPE	Independent
GEOGRAPHICAL FOCUS	Brazil

The outcomes from a Food Systems Summit Dialogue will be of use in developing the pathway to sustainable food systems within the locality in which they take place. They will be a valuable contribution to the national pathways and also of interest to the different workstreams preparing for the Summit: the Action Tracks, Scientific Groups and Champions as well as for other Dialogues.

1. PARTICIPATION

TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS

81

PARTICIPATION BY AGE RANGE

0-18

20

19-30

41

31-50

8

51-65

66-80

80+

PARTICIPATION BY GENDER

35 Male

46 Female

Prefer not to say or Other

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS IN EACH SECTOR

4 Agriculture/crops

7 Fish and aquaculture

Livestock

1 Agro-forestry

15 Environment and ecology

Trade and commerce

21 Education

1 Communication

Food processing

Food retail, markets

Food industry

Financial Services

1 Health care

1 Nutrition

1 National or local government

Utilities

Industrial

29 Other

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS FROM EACH STAKEHOLDER GROUP

Small/medium enterprise/artisan

Large national business

Multi-national corporation

17 Small-scale farmer

Medium-scale farmer

Large-scale farmer

11 Local Non-Governmental Organization

International Non-Governmental Organization

7 Indigenous People

27 Science and academia

Workers and trade union

Member of Parliament

Local authority

1 Government and national institution

Regional economic community

United Nations

International financial institution

Private Foundation / Partnership / Alliance

Consumer group

17 Other

2. PRINCIPLES OF ENGAGEMENT

HOW DID YOU ORGANIZE THE DIALOGUE SO THAT THE PRINCIPLES WERE INCORPORATED, REINFORCED AND ENHANCED?

The dialogue was organised with a sense of urgency the face of acute pressures and attacks on food producing communities in the Amazon and Cerrado biomes, and the Northeastern region of Brazil (see attached Denouncement). The dialogue was prepared, delivered, synthesised and evaluated via an organising committee comprised of riverine, forest and quilombola representatives; non-governmental organisations and academic partners from the areas. These Organisers were invited to suggest 16 invitees each, and the list was reviewed to ensure a balance in terms of participation, gender, and multi-stakeholder engagement that respected and embraced ancestral and indigenous knowledge and academic-based evidence. Several regional pre-dialogue meetings were hosted by committee members and additional communication was undertaken in response to concerns over community voices being lost, and also the limitations of technological access. Partner organisations went to remarkable lengths to ensure participation of those with limited or no access to the online platforms. A pre-event 66 page diagnostic report was prepared and shared with all participants in advance of the event. This served to: 1) provide community- and academy- based evidence for the critical position being adopted; 2) relate concerns with the dominant, industrialised food system to previous and contemporary FAO documents and strategy; 3) ensure the dialogue event would not revisit critiques of the above, but rather focus on the roots and pathways towards transforming agrifood systems that can systemically safeguard territory, ancestral practices, health, land, water in culturally and bio-diverse ecosystems. The engagement of 16 experienced facilitators and note takers (who attended a briefing session) ensured that the discussions between the stakeholders, organised in transversal, heterogeneous groups (of no more than 9 people), were respectful and that each participant could be heard. The participants were aware that their individual and collective contribution would inform the report that now follows.

HOW DID YOUR DIALOGUE REFLECT SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF THE PRINCIPLES?

The convenors were delighted by the response to the invitation and the diversity of stakeholders from indigenous territories; quilombola, African-descendant communities; agrarian reform settlements, fishing and forest communities. Interestingly, approximately one half of participants identified as 'other' in relation to the demographic questions. The dialogue hinges on an urgent appeal for action in the face of attacks and the dismantling of public policies that previously supported smaller scale, sustainable food producing communities. In other words, the 'urgency' of the principles is reflected in the attached denouncement, passed unanimously by the participants. This calls for an end of degrading processes to the environment and human life, so that healthy, sustainable agrifood models that enhance human life and its positive relations with nature can be (re)constructed and maintained. Significant steps were taken in the preparation for the dialogue to share with the diverse stakeholders the SDG ambitions and responsibilities that sit with FAO, and the previous briefing papers most relevant to our dialogue (attached 'Opening Presentation'). This was designed to build upon previous work and enable us to emphasise more specific blind spots and needed actions in constructing agrifood systems. The pre event report, preparatory meetings and a preparatory webinar with more than 40 participants sought to ensure inclusivity of diverse voices. The event was structured into small working groups to ensure voices were heard and noted. The timing of the event was also organised to ensure optimum engagement, given the reliance on an online format, and the decision of a shorter event was taken in consultation with communities committing to the process. The organisers were honoured that leaders from indigenous, forest, riverine and agrarian communities went to considerable lengths to participate; and the opening comments (attached Report) from an indigenous woman was important in outlining the urgency, the expectations, and responsibilities for those attending the event.

DO YOU HAVE ADVICE FOR OTHER DIALOGUE CONVENORS ABOUT APPRECIATING THE PRINCIPLES OF ENGAGEMENT?

The difficulties presented by COVID-19 and the consequent reliance on online platforms was a barrier to engagement. The preparation of a user-friendly online document for registration that complied with FAO regulation and our own data protection and ethical policies proved very important in ensuring ethical and informed participation. The dialogue could not have succeeded without the committed support of members of the organising team, community and civil society organisations who communicated with potential participants in advance of the dialogue; assisted in registration; facilitated the installation of internet access in geographically remote areas; and throughout the event itself provided support for entry and participation in the meeting. The engagement across community, university, civil society and statutory bodies raises issues of access, power and privilege. It is considered that explicitly acknowledging these and discussion often uncomfortable issues that arise from this also strengthened trust and confidence in the process. It is evident that working through the outcomes from the dialogue must continue to be attentive to this and ensure the same voices rendered invisible in dominant agroindustrialised food systems are not lost in these important developments.

3. METHOD

The outcomes of a Dialogue are influenced by the method that is used.

DID YOU USE THE SAME METHOD AS RECOMMENDED BY THE CONVENORS REFERENCE MANUAL?

Yes

No

4. DIALOGUE FOCUS & OUTCOMES

MAJOR FOCUS

The Dialogue posed two simple questions, "What is the agrifood system you want to build?" and, "How can you construct this food system"? It was immediately evident that complex agrifood systems, organised and practiced in distinct territories and biomes have existed for centuries. Their defence and reproduction, therefore can not be separated out from the human-nature interactions that have produced profound knowledge, sustained diverse cultures and communities, and produced food in cycles that are in tune with the environment and have not required manufactured, fossil fuel-based and harmful inputs. In the current national, international political and economic climate, these food systems are being threatened by the advances of hydroelectric dams, agribusiness, deforestation, mining and other invasive action by illegal land grabbers and financial corporations at a pace and extent that unprecedented in recent times. While plantations and homes are being torched; while leaders are forced into hiding, while invasions and land grabs are either ignored or encouraged, then communities can not realise their productive potential. As we heard, a mother who must defend attacks on her territory against armed men has less time in the house with the family, less time in the field to plant, less time to pass knowledge. For every life that is lost, indigenous aldeia burnt, or community dismantled, there follows a loss of knowledge, of diversity, of possibilities for transforming inequitable, unjust and dangerous systems of production. This 'defence' of existing agrifood systems is first.

Secondly, we open a dialogue with FAO and invite the organisation to recognise that we can not imagine, create, technically support, value and validate sustainable agrifood systems in the absence of resolute protection of the rights of food producing communities (recognised in many FAO documents; see appendix report 1), who through their everyday practice defend and protect some of the globe's most important and complex ecosystems. Without access to land, to clean water, to security and health, or public policies to safeguard long fought for rights, communities cannot progress existing knowledge, safeguard health and family; nor 'boost nature-positive production', or equality. The most immediate 'shocks and stresses' impacting communities are often from the very same agents proclaiming higher yields, clean energy, new trade opportunities, economic growth and development linked to dominant commodity trades. 'Equitable relations' and 'nature-positive' production are possible; indeed the latter has been practiced by stakeholders and can be strengthened via the dialogue outcomes below. The success of this dialogue in unveiling key actors in a dominant inequitable, contemporary food system; in avoiding nostalgic reflections of the past in favour of deep-rooted and determined resistance to further violent, dispossession; and articulating pathways for a future agrifood system merits broader attention.

Importantly, the dialogue links the 'pathways' for a food system transformation to the deep 'roots' of communities whose material and spiritual life is embedded in their distinct territories. This advances the discussion and strategy towards sustainable food systems by transferring knowledge and practices of food production, of collective resistance; of legal strategies; of technical support where it is invited (and not imposed) across traditional and more recently settled agrarian communities. The reproduction, restoration, and re-existence of ancestral knowledge, human and plant cultures, and of practices are essential to a future agrifood system. The maintenance of conditions for production (land, soil, air and water), and circulation of foods free of harmful substances are needed. The support of these from innovations in research, technique and policy that respect and build from ancestral, in-situ knowledge underpin the forward looking strategies that are articulated below.

ACTION TRACKS

<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 1: Ensure access to safe and nutritious food for all
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 2: Shift to sustainable consumption patterns
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 3: Boost nature-positive production
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 4: Advance equitable livelihoods
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 5: Build resilience to vulnerabilities, shocks and stress

KEYWORDS

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Finance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Policy
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Innovation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Data & Evidence
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Human rights	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Governance
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Women & Youth Empowerment	<input type="checkbox"/>	Trade-offs
<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Environment and Climate

MAIN FINDINGS

The Dialogue finds that:

a) territorial respect, protection and sovereignty are paramount.

The arguably unprecedented scale and pace of attack on food producing communities, whose food sovereignty has been undermined, compromised and in many cases ended, demands immediate action across our networks, in dialogue with international organisations, including FAO (see outcome 1). Participants vocalised the loss, and painful consequences of a 74% increase in deforestation in indigenous territories in the last year; and the 1,576 land-related conflicts, violent threats and assassinations in 2020, the highest number recorded since 1985, 25% higher than 2019 and 57.6% in 2018 (CPT 2020) .

b) the presence of internationally renowned companies and financial institutions in the land grabs, and encroachment from speculation and agroindustry (see outcome 4), highlights the disingenuous character of attempts to tie agrifood, community-based systems to commodified trades. Mato Grosso state, Brazil's 'granary' exemplifies this, with 76% of all agricultural devoted to commodities for export, rising to 98% in some fertile regions such as Basin of Rio Juruena (leaving just 2% of available land to food production).

c) ecologically-sensitive, food sovereignty can not be separated from territorial and human rights. These rights, many encompassed in the SDGs for 2030, are being systematically contravened. In Brazil, the instrumentalisation of the Rural Land Registration (CAR), and the use of third companies by transnational speculators is providing a veneer of legality for land that has been illegally appropriated for cattle and soy production. The Dialogue finds that State, and Federal laws are routinely broken in the appropriation of public lands and community territories, and international conventions, such as ILO Convention 169 contravened for large scale industrial advance.

d) there is an urgent need for a reconstruction of public policies (see outcome 2) for traditional and familial agriculture. We note: (i) the extinction of the Agrarian Development Ministry (with budget of R\$30 billion); (ii) the hollowing out of the Food Acquisition Program-PAA (recognised for good practice by FAO in 2014) that fell from R\$586 million for 115,489 food suppliers in 2012 to just R\$41 million for 5,585 suppliers of food in only half as many municipalities; (iii) that Legal guidelines (Law 11.326/2006) for the National Policy on Family Agriculture insist that beneficiaries are the following peoples i) forest ii) aquaculturists; iii) extractivist; iv) fishing (artisanal); v) indigenous peoples; vi) remnant communities of rural quilombos and other traditional peoples and communities. (The last two groups of beneficiaries were included in Law No. 12,512 of 2011).

e) the above changes are linked to Brazil's return to the global hunger map, with a drastic fall of food security from 77% of the population in 2014 to only 44% in 2020, with 55.2% experiencing food insecurity; and 9% living with hunger. The Dialogue makes the important distinction between food sovereignty and access to food, as the focus is on strengthening food producing systems that guarantee conditions for in situ production; but also making safe food available to rural and urban populations.

f) transforming agrifood systems involves the strengthening of counter-hegemonic networks, organising local arrangements to support and promote food production that maintains families, young and old in distinct territories; and links this safe, health food production to rural and urban communities currently facing hunger.

Food producing territories are being invaded; where they are not, most are now encircled by agribusiness and commodity plantations, with grave implications for access, contamination and compromised food production.

g) quality of life, of food and food systems matter: Brazil remains within the top 3 consumers of agrotoxins in the world, a hazard that we argue is under analysed by FAO to date. Stakeholders draw attention to the detriment to health, to watercourses, air, food, vegetables from the intensive and extensive use of these chemicals that compromise local efforts of chemical free production. In Mato Gross, there were four deaths from 2007 to 2016. Of the 141 municipalities in Mato Grosso, 83 reported occupational poisoning by agricultural pesticides.

The stakeholders urge a considered response from FAO in dialogue with this event. It is recognised that FAO cannot alone resolve the structural impediments to a transformed food system that protects human rights and biodiverse ecosystems. It can, however, help to name the key systemic problems. These are unveiled here by many stakeholders who are symbolically and physically marginalised from decision making, yet whose humid, biodiverse territories, forests and soils are so central to profit seeking by agribusiness. This contradiction is, we argue, untenable: the reproduction and deepening of the consequent injustice leads to charges of genocide and ecoside from various stakeholders.

The violence we find is not an abstraction but a daily occurrence. Communities who historically, and more recently, have occupied land in order to live peacefully and productively, ought to be able to do so, free of harassment, eviction and period flights of refuge.

The Dialogue finds that defence of their rights and territories, in which roots for healthy and sustainable food systems exist, can lead to reconstructed agrifood systems that promise a socially and ecologically committed future.

ACTION TRACKS

<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 1: Ensure access to safe and nutritious food for all
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 2: Shift to sustainable consumption patterns
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 3: Boost nature-positive production
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 4: Advance equitable livelihoods
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 5: Build resilience to vulnerabilities, shocks and stress

KEYWORDS

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Finance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Policy
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Innovation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Data & Evidence
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Human rights	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Governance
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Women & Youth Empowerment	<input type="checkbox"/>	Trade-offs
<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Environment and Climate

OUTCOMES FOR EACH DISCUSSION TOPIC - 1/6

a) Territorial sovereignty and food production

"They took over our territory and we no longer have the right to come and go. We are increasingly surrounded by agribusiness. We don't want our communities to depend on manufactured products for a living."

It is necessary to defend the territory so that there is space for families to continue producing on the land.

The territorial integrity of the communities is fundamental. This means recognition of the boundaries of these collectively occupied lands, and upholding the protective Federal laws:

http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2007-2010/2007/decreto/d6040.htm;
http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/decreto/2003/d4887.htm

that are not respected in practice.

It also means that the water, seeds and soils should not be taken, extracted modified, or contaminated by unwelcome activities within or in the vicinity of the territories.

The network should share experience and legal expertise to assist those communities who are still awaiting final demarcation of their lands-often for decade or more. For this, the role of supportive organisations, lawyer associations (e.g. AATR) are important in sharing best practice and pathways to successful demarcation.

Consultation. Communities have rights to be fully informed and consulted on matters that affect their lives (e.g. ILO Convention 169, the United Nations Declaration on Rights of Indigenous Peoples and the American Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples). Communities can articulate their own consultation protocols, with support from the Federal Public Ministry, to outline their own visions and plans for the community.

We need respect for ancestry, traditions of peoples and communities, and support the recovery of cultures that are being undermined and attacked.

It is evident that organisation and resistance by these communities allows us to have this dialogue. For this, the residents of the communities are articulating and organizing themselves, so that they can achieve benefits and improvements for the community to be able to produce and live. The violence against peasant and traditional communities is reducing the area to plant and diverting time and energy from the production of healthy food.

Ensure that we take care of the memory. The immense damage means that we often can't even keep track of events. The learning from Belo Monte (Xingu Vivo, 2021), for example, must be shared so that it cannot happen again. We must show the effects also to those investors and companies involved in the massive scale projects, infrastructure, ports that have created harm and currently face charges of genocide (appendix) so that minds can be changed. Research teams can assist in understanding and publicise these hidden parts of production (Rede Social, 2020). Outsourcing oppressive security teams or land grabbing does not absolve corporations of responsibility.

The agrifood system we want requires us to be able to use our entire territory, we need more space, not least because we don't have productivity in 100% of our areas. With smaller and smaller spaces, there is a lack of food and, therefore, it is difficult to guarantee a livelihood. We want to be sure that our children and grandchildren will also be able to stay in our territories. We want the environment to be protected.

Community leaders cannot produce food sustainably when they are seeking refuge in exile, and when their houses or plantations have been burnt.

ACTION TRACKS

<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 1: Ensure access to safe and nutritious food for all
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 2: Shift to sustainable consumption patterns
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 3: Boost nature-positive production
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 4: Advance equitable livelihoods
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 5: Build resilience to vulnerabilities, shocks and stress

KEYWORDS

<input type="checkbox"/>	Finance	<input type="checkbox"/>	Policy
<input type="checkbox"/>	Innovation	<input type="checkbox"/>	Data & Evidence
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Human rights	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Governance
<input type="checkbox"/>	Women & Youth Empowerment	<input type="checkbox"/>	Trade-offs
<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Environment and Climate

OUTCOMES FOR EACH DISCUSSION TOPIC - 2/6

(Re)constructing Public policies for agrifood production

" Today there is no support or funding for anything. The açai harvest is over, the farmer has no other possibility: he has to go to [the city of] Belem to be a bricklayer's assistant. If he had incentive, he would stay on his land and produce".

1.The sharing of experiences and connections at the event should refocus energy and activity to:

- a) Create and strengthen rural public policies (health, education, culture)
- b) Create and strengthen public policies for rural youth that encourage them to remain in rural territories and avoid exploitative work in agribusiness, often synonymous with slave-like labour
- c) Advocate that existing law complied with and not dismantled; with Agrarian Reform as a central concern and demand
- d) improve popular education to build a broad understanding of state decision making, and help put pressure on local and state authorities (city councilors and deputies) to honour commitments to food producing communities; and to enhance the many inspiring community initiatives that have built before and during the pandemic. This relates to a need to inform policy agendas, demonstrate and lobby for policy changes in advance of elections.
- e) the naming and condemnation of those who overexploit fish stocks and seafood that includes smuggling and overfishing of regionally distinct species, or decimation of species through massive projects (e.g. Belo Monte)
- f) strengthen/ensure emancipatory public policies (e.g. Technical assistance and rural extension -ATER) to facilitate food sovereignty

2.Technical support

Interest (or not) and demands in relation to technical support are specific to particular areas, histories and realities.

Stakeholders propose the following:

- a) Non-interest finance for Traditional Peoples, Communities and small farmers for land and food sovereignty, not indebtedness
- b) Specially designated public financing for family farming and sustainable food programmes; with agroecological technical support; rather than promotion of imposed and polluting technologies
- c) For families and young people to remain on the land, technology and financing are needed, creating conditions to plant: irrigation systems where appropriate, adequate machinery; that the agriculture of the ancestors can incorporate technologies and continue to be modernized and encouraged, with the support of universities, federal institutes and the government.
- d) In agro-extractivist areas, strategies that are supported by favourable public policy must help generate sustainable income for the families who live there.
- e) Effective health, education, social assistance and technical policies, that respect diverse cultures, towards sustaining life and food sovereignty

3.Recognition of crime

Although the extent of cultural and environmental harm is incalculable, engagement with FAO in the first instance towards an effective regulatory framework that prosecutes, rather than imposes fines, on harmful corporations who easily absorb these costs

Engage with the individuals and organisations that are putting Ecoside, the systematic destruction of the environment, on national and international policy agendas

4. SDG targets

FAO states that by 2030 SDG 2 would, "double the agricultural productivity and incomes of small-scale food producers, in particular women, indigenous peoples, family farmers, pastoralists and fishers, including through secure and equal access to land, other productive resources and inputs, knowledge, financial services, markets and opportunities for value addition and non-farm employment".

Concerted, co-ordinated action, in tandem with affected communities, is required at a range of local, regional and international scales to reverse to current dismantling of agrifood systems and we seek to open the dialogue with FAO in this regard.

This includes a call for an end to the dismantling of public organs with social and environmental responsibility.

ACTION TRACKS

<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 1: Ensure access to safe and nutritious food for all
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 2: Shift to sustainable consumption patterns
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 3: Boost nature-positive production
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 4: Advance equitable livelihoods
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 5: Build resilience to vulnerabilities, shocks and stress

KEYWORDS

<input type="checkbox"/>	Finance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Policy
<input type="checkbox"/>	Innovation	<input type="checkbox"/>	Data & Evidence
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Human rights	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Governance
<input type="checkbox"/>	Women & Youth Empowerment	<input type="checkbox"/>	Trade-offs
<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Environment and Climate

OUTCOMES FOR EACH DISCUSSION TOPIC - 3/6

Agrifood and agroecological production

"In total there are 150 farming families. They agroecologically plant fruits, cassava, short-cycle and perennial plants. Families in agroecological transition. They suffer a lot of harassment from the mills. They offer, or rather, rent the poison, seeds, machinery, and buy all the production from the small ones who are willing to produce sugarcane – and then deduct all the expenses. Families are sometimes unable to sell their food production, and as the mill buys all the sugarcane that is planted, some families surrender to the monoculture of sugarcane."

There is a need to create new -and reinvigorate existing - productive, solidarity arrangements for the circulation of healthy food between rural and urban locales, and that omit exploitative intermediaries. These connections should be articulated at national and international level to confront massive scale, wasteful industrialised chains of production.

This network should also help challenge the 'modernity' of agroindustry where 10 to 20 liters of pesticides are used for each hectare of monoculture. We recognize that there is ongoing destruction with a complicit legal apparatus. Who or what gives power to a person to build a business to destroy others?

We must strengthen ecological -based agriculture in place of harmful practices .

We must, therefore,
-create new, and build upon existing, local productive arrangements and networks of solidarity between communities. These should share knowledge, co-ordinate activities, agroecological experience that organize national events and connected with global processes,
-build and share education and technical assistance focused on agroecological roots and innovations.
-find progressive financing and partnerships to build collective spaces to encourage the production and sale of healthy food; Such an agrifood system values the knowledge of traditional peoples, their production techniques, and includes women and youth. It enhances knowledge and practice at local and regional level, anchored in the particularities of place and diversity

The replacement of harmful systems requires a constitution of circuits that safeguard a socially committed market for food and ensures access to food; the countryside and the city

Share the best practice of seed banks for safeguarding and reproduction of creole seeds (see MCP), free from contamination from agribusiness or exploitation from corporations. (see International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture).

It is necessary to encourage the agroecological transition so that more farmers can produce with quality; there must be public markets so that peasants can have their food sold. It is also necessary to invest in the education of young people.

More universities and technical schools focused on genuine sustainability and experiments are needed so that future generations can learn what is best and exchange learning with communities.

- Public policies that value sustainable, healthy family farming and agroecology as a food production model are necessary. Despite arguments to the contrary, this model is capable of producing food in the quantity necessary for human demands for food, especially considering innovate techniques, for example, poly-cultural production that feeds producers and allows for the sale of surplus.

Agroecology is a very important tool in the dispute of agricultural model for the countryside, only in this way can we guarantee respect for Mother Earth, for ancestral knowledge, and for all beings that inhabit this common home .

Its growth requires strengthening socio-political networks and joint efforts with partnerships between associations, unions, social movements, universities, churches, public authorities to continue the production of healthy food. Strengthening of production networks (production, management, marketing) of agroecological and organic production. Establishing, expanding and strengthening partnership between universities, research institutes and other organizations of research and make available equipment, machinery, and inputs suitable and affordable for family farming.

ACTION TRACKS

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 1: Ensure access to safe and nutritious food for all
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 2: Shift to sustainable consumption patterns
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 3: Boost nature-positive production
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 4: Advance equitable livelihoods
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action Track 5: Build resilience to vulnerabilities, shocks and stress

KEYWORDS

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Finance	<input type="checkbox"/>	Policy
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Innovation	<input type="checkbox"/>	Data & Evidence
<input type="checkbox"/>	Human rights	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Governance
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Women & Youth Empowerment	<input type="checkbox"/>	Trade-offs
<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Environment and Climate

OUTCOMES FOR EACH DISCUSSION TOPIC - 4/6

Towards health and security, and away from harm in agrifood systems

"In the community, which is directly bordering the crop, there was arial spraying less than 10 meters from homes of often elderly residents, making it impossible to produce food, because the plants dry and die every time the spraying occurs".

"We were always healthy. Nothing bad happened to us. Before, we didn't even use medication"

1.
 - a) Join calls and actions towards the prohibition of harmful and hazardous agrottoxins (pesticides, herbicide, fungicides, maturing agents, drying agents) in agriculture;
 - b) The construction of an alternative agrifood system involves sanitary and food surveillance with stronger mechanisms for punishing actions of harmful food providers; demand inspection follows from denouncements
 - c) Defend and promote agroecological production, free of pesticides, fossil fuel based inputs, and heavy metals (see outcome 3)
 - d) Committed to reducing pandemic and syndemics through productive strategies that avoid further habitat and forest loss and monocultural encroachment in biodiverse, complex ecosystem.
 - e) Avail of training and promotion of agroecology (eg Agroecology and Citizenship, Para)
- Insist on protection of our food, our water, our crops, our animals, our well-being. "Even our bees are being impacted".

"Recently, a Quilombola community in the Pantanal region of Mato Grosso suffered from chemical dust arising from the surrounding soy plantations, leading about 15 people, including children, adolescents and adults to seek assistance at the Health Unit after presenting signs and symptoms of intoxication acute, such as headaches, difficulty breathing, nausea, vomiting and dizziness".

2.
 - a) Advocate for toxin free territories
 - b) Greater transparency about how our food is produced, and know the traceability of its production chain;
 - c) An agri-food system where reroducing life is the priority, not profit. For this, it will be necessary to build a new way of existing as a society.

"It is cruel to know that the current food system prevents the reproduction of traditional peoples' food without pesticides is very good, even for our health. We often get sick from eating food with pesticides. It's good to preserve what we already have and use what is good to produce. That way it is not necessary to deforest, we already have the lake and we can use it to raise the fish, without having to use pesticides that are harmful to health".

3.

The need for a different pathway to food security and food sovereignty is demonstrated in the worrying statistics. There was a drop of 82% in the number of Brazilians in a situation of malnutrition in the period between 2002 and 2013, the State's actions were paramount in the development of policies aimed at food and nutrition security, with emphasis on the Zero Hunger Program and the creation of the Food Acquisition Program (PAA). These were in addition to the National School Feeding Program (PNAE), which was responsible for providing meals to 43 million children in 2012. (FAO, 2014). In fact, if in 2004 food security (SA) was 65.1% after ten years of the PAA's operationalization, it reached 77.4% with a significant decrease in severe food insecurity (FA) (read hunger) of 6.9% to 3.2%, and that is why Brazil had left the hunger map in 2014.

Data from the Household Budget Survey (POF) in 2018 is worrying. The dismantling of social policies is evident, showing that the food security has dramatically decreased and that by December 2020 the Human Right to adequate nutrition was afforded to only 44.8% of Brazilian households. This contravention of the SDG 2 for zero hunger and food security (2.1.2).

ACTION TRACKS

- ✓ Action Track 1: Ensure access to safe and nutritious food for all
- ✓ Action Track 2: Shift to sustainable consumption patterns
- ✓ Action Track 3: Boost nature-positive production
- ✓ Action Track 4: Advance equitable livelihoods
- Action Track 5: Build resilience to vulnerabilities, shocks and stress

KEYWORDS

- Finance
- Policy
- ✓ Innovation
- Data & Evidence
- ✓ Human rights
- Governance
- Women & Youth Empowerment
- Trade-offs
- ✓ Environment and Climate

OUTCOMES FOR EACH DISCUSSION TOPIC - 5/6

The right to, and necessity of, water

"They have no scruples and no sense of dignity. They said nothing would happen and now the river is dry, fish sick, we got sick. An analysis was done and our river was drinking water, healthy, sculpted by nature. Now the oxygen is weak, the iodine... everything changed. They point to [bame] the fisherman, but it is not. They don't like us or the indigenous people because we defend our river, winning or losing, we don't give up. They have a reservoir in which the fish reproduce at the head of the river, there is a dam that does not allow them to return to the river, they stay and die in their dam. We ask to fish there and they forbid it and the fish dies, but they don't let the fisherman fish there, they beat him, take the fish and break his things. There are judges, prosecutors who are for us, but there are others against. Belo Monte did not bring anything good, only the destruction of our rivers. The only thing they bring is money, but we don't take that. God left it for us to take care of, but the human being is destroying it. The Covid virus came because of this greed. I witness fish mortality, I see fish with malformations, greenish water... Belo Monte, like any other enterprise that destroys nature, is rotten".

1. Regulation

- Policies for the effective protection of water, and forests.

- Combating water contamination by any activity, especially mining, with monitoring, inspection and punishment of polluters, by repairing environmental impacts

It ranges from river protection to public policy and labour. It cannot be degrading to working people, it has to be dignified and fair

2.As FAO states there is a need for, "Increased support for small-scale fishers will be critical in light of the coronavirus pandemic to allow them to continue earning a livelihood and nourishing local communities". This is echoed in the calls for action by fishing communities whose rights and access to rivers and fish have been curtailed.

3. Human rights as environmental rights

"They talk about having to the 'Indigenous component' when considering projects. How do you talk about indigenous rights, with the rights of nature, of the forest? They have rights. You can not separate our rights, our life or survival from that of the river, of the trees[...] conservation areas, ecological corridors, these are something, but they are not sufficient"

Agrarian reform settlements, quilombolas; even if surrounded by monocultures, their waters still need to be protected, the superficial water, the rivers, the lakes, the groundwater. The territories, of they are going to be surrounded, at the very least must have clean water, potable water, water for farming within the territories.

4. Water sources must be clean and protected

Communities must have access to clean, potable, usable water to maintain and healthy, agrifood systems. The pattern, unfortunately, is away from this right, and the aspirations of clean water and sanitation that underpin SDG 6: "ensuring availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all); water stress (6.4)"

"Water scarcity, water pollution, degraded water-related ecosystems and cooperation over transboundary water basins", disproportionately affect the most vulnerable people, and according to FAO, "COULD lead to widespread socio-economic disruptions unless urgent measures are taken". Our dialogue points out that, like climate change, these feared disruption are a present and NOT a possible future event. Mitigation for 'future' problems requires urgent action to confront 'today's' challenges and abuses.

ACTION TRACKS

- ✓ Action Track 1: Ensure access to safe and nutritious food for all
- ✓ Action Track 2: Shift to sustainable consumption patterns
- ✓ Action Track 3: Boost nature-positive production
- ✓ Action Track 4: Advance equitable livelihoods
- Action Track 5: Build resilience to vulnerabilities, shocks and stress

KEYWORDS

- | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Finance | ✓ Policy |
| Innovation | Data & Evidence |
| ✓ Human rights | ✓ Governance |
| Women & Youth Empowerment | Trade-offs |
| | ✓ Environment and Climate |

OUTCOMES FOR EACH DISCUSSION TOPIC - 6/6

"So, for me, today we are here to discuss our children's lives. When we talk about a plant, a healthy food, today we plant it with our own hands, we take care of our children... a baby is born, we have to take care of it, and even so, we plant, right, we plant for our children, but we are careful, right. We always have that care."

ACTION TRACKS

- Action Track 1: Ensure access to safe and nutritious food for all
- Action Track 2: Shift to sustainable consumption patterns
- Action Track 3: Boost nature-positive production
- Action Track 4: Advance equitable livelihoods
- Action Track 5: Build resilience to vulnerabilities, shocks and stress

KEYWORDS

- Finance
- Innovation
- Human rights
- Women & Youth Empowerment
- Policy
- Data & Evidence
- Governance
- Trade-offs
- Environment and Climate

AREAS OF DIVERGENCE

The Dialogue did not reveal particular divergences; rather, it insisted on a recognition of the diverse realities, experiences, practices and knowledge that are intimately related to particular environments and territorial designations. For example, a strong message from several representatives of indigenous communities was they were requesting no assistance, no technical support, no intervention other than, simply, being left alone. The life systems like theirs -and many others that were depicted- have existed for generations and could do for generations more if they were left to continue, with an end to encroachment, violence, dislocation and invasion. Their capacity to do so, is of course is dependent on the forest that they protected for centuries. For others where there has been disruption to livelihoods then strategies to recover and revive memory and practices are required. The fate of fishing communities impacted by, for example, dam construction, siltation, pollution has meant that fishing livelihoods must be complemented by new food producing strategies in the territories, a situation complicated by the demise of public policies. Residents of agrarian reform settlements and other agro extractive territories are similarly hampered by unfavourable policy, and the need for progressive, not for profit financial support and technical assistance is articulated. Importantly, the stakeholders of the dialogue represent communities ostensibly protected by conventions to which FAO is signatory, and speak on themes relevant to SDGs for which FAO has responsibility (SDG 2 zero hunger; SDG 5 gender equality; SDG 6 clean water and sanitation; SDG 12 responsible consumption and production; SDG 14 life under water; SDG 15 Life on land).

This serves to further highlight the indivisibility of future, sustainable agrifood systems from upholding the rights of farmers. This is enshrined in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas ; in the Treaties for Indigenous peoples, and in Brazil specific laws for agrarian reform, agroextractive communities and Quilombolas. From the accounts of stakeholders; however, the trajectory, is a regressive one in relation to the key articles of this commitment (these include equality, women's participation, right to nature, civil and political rights, justice, labour rights, food sovereignty, right to land, right to seeds, right to biodiversity; right to water and clean water systems; right to health and social security; right to housing; right to education; cultural rights, traditional knowledge and traditional cultural expressions).

Traditional knowledge and its link to sustainability, food security and climate change Impacts is acknowledged by FAO and its Traditional Knowledge report recognises these "are increasingly endangered by large-scale commercialization of agriculture, population dynamics, land-use/cover changes and the impacts of climate change".

If there is a divergence, it is a broader systemic divergence from the harmful, predatory and wasteful model of commified agroindustrial production. It is an insistence that discourses and misguided attempts to reconcile the interests of sustainable, food producing communities with deep, cultural, spiritual; and practical territorial links with commercialised monocultures and large scale mineral and energy complexes is at best illusory, and at worst genocidal in the view of participants. Amidst a traumatic year of pandemic and, on evidence, yet more missed goals and failed promises in relation to sustainability, human rights and climate change across the globe; the stakeholders invite a formal response from FAO to the violent disruption of agrifood systems in globally important biomes that are articulated here. It is clear that the communities, represented here, will continue to resist further detriment and destruction; but the efforts are costing lives, compromising production, and threatening biodiverse ecosystems. They should no longer be expected to provide 'resilience' to shocks and stresses that are structured, and are predictable in dominant agroindustrialised systems and related environmental changes. These stresses include but are not restricted to climate change. The many immediate problems are articulated above. We modestly ask that this Independent Dialogue begins a critically important dialogue with FAO, that the articulation of violent abuses underlying agroindustrial advance is heightened and addressed through this dialogue and that an ending of the many transgressions can allow us to continue and further the important transformation towards a socially and environmentally committed agrifood system within and beyond the contours of our discussions.

ACTION TRACKS

- ✓ Action Track 1: Ensure access to safe and nutritious food for all
- ✓ Action Track 2: Shift to sustainable consumption patterns
- ✓ Action Track 3: Boost nature-positive production
- ✓ Action Track 4: Advance equitable livelihoods
- ✓ Action Track 5: Build resilience to vulnerabilities, shocks and stress

KEYWORDS

- ✓ Finance
- ✓ Innovation
- ✓ Human rights
- ✓ Women & Youth Empowerment
- ✓ Policy
- ✓ Data & Evidence
- ✓ Governance
- ✓ Trade-offs
- ✓ Environment and Climate

ATTACHMENTS AND RELEVANT LINKS

ATTACHMENTS

- **Denouncement_FAO_2021_English**
https://summitdialogues.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/DENOUNCEMENT_FAO_2021_English.pdf
- **Denouncement_Denuncia_FAO_2021_Portuguese**
https://summitdialogues.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/DENÚNCIA-FAO_2021_Portuguese.pdf
- **Opening presentation_FAO_2021_English**
<https://summitdialogues.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Opening-presentation.pdf>
- **Opening presentation_Fala_de Abertura_FAO_2021_Portuguese**
https://summitdialogues.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/opening-presentation_fala-de-abertura_Portuguese.pdf
- **Pre_Dialogue_Report_FAO_2021_English**
https://summitdialogues.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Pre-Dialogue-Report_FAO_2021_English-version.pdf
- **Pre_Dialogue_Relatorio_Portuguese**
https://summitdialogues.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/pre_Dialogue-Report_FAO_2021_relatorio_Portuguese.pdf

RELEVANT LINKS

- **Land speculation and socio-environmental impacts in the in the Matopiba region (in Portuguese)**
<https://www.social.org.br/pub/revistas-portugues/252-especulacao-com-terras-na-regiao-matopiba-e-impactos-socioambientais>
- **New enclosures, conflict and labour**
<https://www.politiceconomyoflabour.org/Themes/New-enclosures-conflict-and-labour>
- **TRF1 overturns decision that guaranteed water for the Volta Grande do Xingu. MPF must appeal**
<https://xinguvivo.org.br/2021/08/03/trf1-derruba-decisao-que-garantia-agua-para-a-volta-grande-do-xingu-mpf-deve-recorrer/>
- **Consultation Protocol, Montanha and Mangabal community**
<https://acervo.socioambiental.org/acervo/documentos/protocolo-de-consulta-montanha-e-mangabal>
- **Brazil's Jair Bolsonaro is devastating indigenous lands, with the world distracted**
<https://theconversation.com/brazils-jair-bolsonaro-is-devastating-indigenous-lands-with-the-world-distracted-138478>
- **Conflicts in the Field: Pastoral Land Commission (in Portuguese)**
<https://www.cptnacional.org.br/publicacoes/noticias/conflitos-no-campo>
- **Seeds of Life: Popular Campones Movement (in Portuguese)**
<https://www.mcpbrasil.org/sementes-da-vida>