

CERESAN

The Reference Center for Food and
Nutrition Security

cpda
UFRRJ

MNS
UFF

Brazilian South-South cooperation in food and nutrition security and sovereignty: research findings and agenda setting

Renato S. Maluf

Mariana Santarelli

Collaborators

Bruno Prado
Francisco Sarmiento
Hélder Marcelino
Jeremias Vunjanhe
João Pinto
Luciana Gama Muniz
Maria de La-Salette Morgado
Sandra Martins
Veruska Prado Alexandre
Vicente Adriano

Working Papers, 9

May - 2015


OXFAM

CERESAN – *The Reference Center for Food and Nutrition Security is a center for studies, research, and training that brings together researchers, specialists, students, and other professionals interested in issues related to food and nutrition security in Brazil and around the world. CERESAN has headquarters at UFRRJ/CPDA, coordinated by Renato S. Maluf, and at UFF/MNS, coordinated by Luciene Burlandy. www.ufrj.br/cpda/ceresan*

OXFAM – Oxfam is an international confederation of 17 organizations acting in over 90 countries. Throughout its 50 years of history in Brazil, Oxfam has contributed to strengthening the third sector, supported rural community-based organizations, and defended human rights and economic fairness.

OUTLINE

Introduction	04
Main aspects related to Brazilian south-south cooperation in food and nutrition security and sovereignty	05
i. Current transformations in international cooperation for development	05
ii. Expanding Brazilian cooperation in Food and Nutrition Security and Sovereignty	05
iii. Brazil and the international Food and Nutrition Security and Sovereignty agenda	06
iv. The role of Brazil in the international family farming agenda	07
v. Trends and transitions of the international cooperation scenario in Africa	08
vi. Controversies and complementarities in Brazil's cooperation in Africa	09
vii. Combining South-South cooperation and regional integration in Latin America and the Caribbean	10
viii. Innovations in the Brazilian South-South cooperation experience	12
ix. The absence of a national policy on South-South cooperation	12
x. Spreading conflicting and contradictory perspectives	13
xi. The fragility of the institutional apparatus	13
xii. Limited transparency and lack of social participation mechanisms	14
xiii. Issues raised by policy dissemination and transfer	15
Discussions points and recommendations for building a public agenda	16
i. Agreeing on a Brazilian policy for South-South cooperation and configure and intersectoral institutionality	16
ii. Design a South-South cooperation strategy for food and nutrition security and sovereignty and for the human right to food	17
iii. Promote social participation	19
iv. Transparency and knowledge production	20

Brazilian South-South cooperation in food and nutrition security and sovereignty: research findings and agenda setting

Renato S. Maluf
Mariana Santarelli¹

Introduction

This text presents a summary of the findings and recommendations produced by the project entitled *Strengthening the Role of Brazil in International Spaces for a Global Agenda in Favor of the Human Right to Food and for Eradicating Hunger*, that was developed by the Reference Centre for Food and Nutrition Security (CERESAN) with the support of OXFAM. The goal of the project was to qualify the debate and give support to the creation of collaborative agendas between Brazilian and foreign social actors involved in Brazilian South-South Cooperation (SSC) in order to strengthen social participation and promote the human right to food (RtF). The Brazilian Forum of Food and Nutrition Security and Sovereignty (FBSSAN) and the National Council for Food and Nutrition Security (CONSEA) are the main Brazilian actors envisaged by the project.

The project approached the Brazilian South-South cooperation from the perspectives of food and nutrition security (FNS), food sovereignty and RtF in light of international development cooperation tendencies. Specific studies were conducted on the FNS strategy adopted by Countries Community of Portuguese Official Language Countries (CPLP), on three African countries that are part of that bloc (Angola, Cape Verde, and Mozambique), and on Brazilian cooperation with Latin American and the Caribbean countries that are part of Mercosur (Common Market of the South) and Community of Latin American and Caribbean States (CELAC). Such documents are available as working papers on CERESAN's webpage: www.ufrj.br/cpda/ceresan/documentos.php.

What we present here was taken from the afore mentioned documents written by various authors enriched by contributions from two debates gathering social actors. Our hope is to contribute to creating guidelines for a collaborative agenda based on recent and controversial yet promising Brazilian FNSS South-South cooperation.

¹Renato S. Maluf is a professor at CPDA/UFRJ and a CERESAN coordinator; Mariana Santarelli is a doctoral student at CPDA/UFRJ and a CERESAN research member.

Main aspects related to Brazilian South-South cooperation in food and nutrition security and sovereignty

i. Current transformations in international cooperation for development

The transformations taking place in International Cooperation for Development (ICD) reflect progressive reductions in North-South cooperation and the participation of new donors, especially the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, and South Africa). Brazil was able to transition from a cooperation recipient to cooperation donor partially because of domestic policy changes, albeit having insufficient political and institutional policies in place to make the process sustainable.

Due to internal and external factors, the countries in the North changed their thematic and regional cooperation focus and redefined their priorities, which included removing countries like Brazil from their agenda. Despite the reduced amount of invested resources from traditional donors, these new actors were able to foster innovative cooperation dynamics based on solidarity and horizontal rhetoric of what is now called South-South cooperation (SSC).

ii. Expanding Brazilian cooperation in Food and Nutrition Security and Sovereignty

Brazilian cooperation in FNS experienced a period of rapid growth between 2003 and 2010, at the same time that the agenda of global food security became a focus of attention in international debate.

The underlying factors of this growth include: a) Brazilian foreign policy under the Lula administration prioritized strengthening South-South relationships in a way that reflected both the growing visibility of Brazil's experience in addressing hunger and creating participative and intersectoral FNS policies, and the national capacity to increase grain production; b) global food security issues were re-addressed as a result of the 2006/07 food crisis and the ensuing conflicts between opposing paradigms, a context in which Brazil promotes both the strengthening of family and peasant farming (especially in Latin America and the Caribbean), and the shaping of a new version of the Green Revolution (especially in Africa); c) the increased attention to the nutrition aspect of food security by international organizations and national governments, including private organizations with ambiguous interests guided by the market.

The symbolic relevance of FNS in Brazilian international cooperation is due to the

positive results attained by the Zero Hunger Strategy launched in 2003 by former President Lula, and by an active international presidential agenda. The perspective of politicizing hunger and thus removing it from the strict limitations of technical strategies helps explain why the Brazilian position was so broadly accepted internationally. Despite being questioned at home, the international community values Brazil's capacity to combine family farming and agribusiness, and to incorporate elements of social protection and the dimension of nutrition into its policies. Among the programs that gained most international visibility, and which are today part of the National Policy on Food and Nutrition Security (PNSAN), are the School Meal Feeding Programme (PNAE), the Food Purchase Programme (PAA), the *Bolsa Família* (Family Grant) Programme, the Maternal Milk Banks, and the National Program to Strengthen Family Farming (PRONAF). The technical expertise of Embrapa (Brazilian Agriculture and Livestock Research Corporation) - a company with a long history of international cooperation - has an important place in the government's cooperation agenda. Its transfers of technology to tropical agriculture is presented as part of the solution to hunger, despite internal controversies about associating these technologies to expanding monocultures and large scale livestock production in Brazil.

iii. Brazil and the international Food and Nutrition Security and Sovereignty agenda

Brazil's experience is often presented as a reference of intersectoral and participatory approach to FNS national policies for countries in the Global South. It is a framework internationally promoted by a network of actors that includes civil society networks and organizations, governments FAO, World Food Program, and other international organizations.

The participation of Brazilian actors in the international agenda was accentuated by the Special Program for Food Security (SPFS) launched by FAO in 1995, and the World Food Summit and NGO/CSO Forum for Food Sovereignty that took place in Rome in 1996, which had numerous delegates from Brazilian civil society and became a global landmark for food sovereignty. More recently, Brazil has been contributing to the recognition of hunger as an essentially political problem that requires adopting national plans, building institutional capacities, mobilizing and promoting civil society participation in public policies, prioritizing family farmers and vulnerable groups, and adopting a systemic approach to FNS. Brazil participated in numerous regional groups like the Regional Network of Civil Society for Food Security in PALOP (REDSAN - PALOP), and later the REDSAN - CPLP, both conducted in Africa, as well as the Hunger-Free Latin American and Caribbean Initiative launched by the presidents of Brazil and Guatemala with the support

of the FAO Regional Office for the continent. International delegations made frequent visits to Brazil to understand the Brazilian experience, which created a significant demand for South-South cooperation that the country was not quite properly prepared to accommodate. It is worth noting that Brazil's position, led by an organized political action to influence the international FNS agenda, strengthened its presence in the FAO office for Latin America and the Caribbean, and culminated in a Brazilian being elected to the position of FAO Director-General.

iv. The role of Brazil in the international family farming agenda

Family farming is at the core of FNS policies and is also an international field highly influenced by the Brazilian experience.

Here we highlight the Mercosur Specialized Meeting about Family Farming (REAF – MERCOSUR), a forum made up of government and civil society representatives from Extended Mercosur countries that has become a space for establishing convergences and common ground for agendas, which carry over to the policies of the respective countries. REAF is an important source of demand for Brazilian cooperation in, for example, structuring national registries for family farming and formulating special policies for the sector. On one hand, consolidating family farming as a public policy category that requires special policies involves cultural battles and ideological changes that position family farming as part of the solution rather than as the target of public aid policies. On the other hand, there is a certain resistance from within social organizations and movements to a conceptual and political unification that may obscure the specificities of peasant and indigenous people. A proposal to formulate a Framework Law for Family Farming in the Latin American Parliament (Parlatino) and to create a Mercosur Family Farming Fund is in progress.

REAF has served beyond its own sphere as a platform for family farming organizations and governments from other countries in Latin America, such as the recent creation of a working group about family farming and sustainable development in the CELAC and in Africa with a corresponding initiative in the CPLP. The Family Farming WG plays a driving role in the Council for Food and Nutrition Security (CONSAN – CPLP), which so far has a limited existence. It is worth noting that the strategies adopted by the Brazilian government and by Brazilian civil society organizations and networks, often collaboratively combine: i) proactive regional participation (Mercosur, CELAC, and CPLP); ii) South-South cooperation; iii) and international advocacy in international organizations,

participatory spaces and campaigns, such as FAO, the UN Committee on World Food Security (WFS), and in the activities of the 2014 International Year of Family Farming declared by the UN. Reflecting the observation mentioned earlier, Latin American and the Caribbean countries extended the International Year to incorporate peasant and indigenous farming, thus adding complexities to the construction of concepts that are common to these categories in the countries of this continent.

v. Trends and transitions of the international cooperation scenario in Africa

The recent and progressive reduction of international food assistance to the African continent has been accompanied by significant changes in international cooperation paradigms and national policies. This process of transitioning views and strategies brings these countries closer to the Brazilian FNS public policies framework, and also to the conflicts associated to it.

Case studies conducted in three CPLP member states – Angola, Cape Verde, and Mozambique – revealed similarities in their trajectories despite their distinct differences as countries. Angola and Mozambique, previously Portuguese colonies that only recently conquered their independence in the mid 1970s, experienced long periods of civil war that disrupted their food production systems. All three countries were affected by the so-called structural adjustment programs that included trade openings that contributed to transforming many African countries into net food importers. After decades of dependence on humanitarian aid because of emergency food situations, food and nutrition security in these countries and in most of Africa is strongly conditioned upon the restricted ability of large portions of the population to access food, fragile productive systems, and foreign dependence.

Recent changes in FNS cooperation paradigms have been observed in the countries that were studied. The Angola study shows that international organizations interrupted humanitarian aid and replaced it with actions based on a “development perspective” that channels cooperation resources to support “democratic governance,” investments, and direct interventions in the general state budget. In Mozambique, the study revealed a transition from a “humanitarian and emergency” approach that was based essentially on the physical availability of food, to a “structural” approach to food security. In Cape Verde the study identified a transition from humanitarian aid to projects of “development” and “good governance.”

All of the countries studied have adopted FNS national strategies and legal frameworks, nevertheless they are making slow progress in meeting the complex challenges related to social participation, intersectoral coordination, decentralization,

limited budgets, and especially political commitment and willingness. All three countries have management and coordination structures in place and all their strategies foresee creating FNS councils, yet only Cape Verde has one that is functioning, albeit in a very fragile manner. Although FAO pushed a political decision to create and approve such national strategies, it resulted in national States fulfilling few of the assumed commitments, in contexts where civil society organizations are not strong enough to pressure them. The “project” characteristic of the initiatives that were intended to generate significant institutional changes does not seem to take into proper account the historical trajectories or institutional conditions of each country.

Civil society participation in national and regional FNS councils (CPLP) is faced with the official understanding that formulating, coordinating, and monitoring policies are roles that belong exclusively to State institutions. Representativity issues and participatory mechanisms are not yet clearly defined, thus participation occurs through a small number of organizations that are typically consulted *a posteriori*, only to legitimize decisions that have already been made. Furthermore, FNS advocacy is in its beginning phases, and related national and regional networks lack sustainability and cohesion.

Parallel to national FNS strategies, the central place of agriculture in African countries led to the production of a series of related planning instruments that are mostly geared toward stimulating the transition from subsistence farming to modern commercial market-oriented agriculture. These plans are highly influenced by the African Union – through the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD) and its Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP) – and by the perspective of a new green revolution, also reinforced by the 2006-2007 food crisis. Complementary to these instruments are strategies to attract foreign investments and agribusiness such as: the National Agriculture Sector Investment Plan (PNISA) in Mozambique; the *PungoAdongo* agricultural project in the Capanda region of Angola; and ProSavana in the Nacala Corridor in Mozambique. Brazil is significantly involved in the latter two. Additionally, initiatives from outside the regions such as the Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA) and the G8’s New Alliance for FNS, intend to integrate large investments in national agricultural policies and favor the participation of large multinational corporations, among others, by simplifying land acquisition procedures and changing seed and fertilizer regulations.

vi. Controversies and complementarities in Brazil’s cooperation with Africa

FNSS became a priority on the Brazil-Africa cooperation agenda, a result of presidential and diplomatic efforts during the Lula administration, driven both by the Zero Hunger experience and

commercial private sector interests. The related cooperation projects have pushed both family farming public policies and large scale export-driven agribusiness.

Brazil made great efforts to disseminate and transfer the public policies that structured its Zero Hunger program and that are today part of the national Brazilian FNS policy, which is the case of *Bolsa Família*, PRONAF, PAA and PNAE. The latter two are implemented in promissory partnerships with FAO and the World Food Program (WFP). However, among all the Brazilian institutions the one that is most present on the African continent is Embrapa. It cooperates mainly with agrarian investigation institutes and in the implementation on of what it considers to be “structuring projects” focused primarily on expanding the frontiers of agribusiness, as is the case of *ProSavana* in Mozambique.

Thus, along with public policy transfers and diffusion, Brazil’s recent advances toward Africa (not only Lusophone Africa) tend to combine investment strategies, technical cooperation, and financing in specific countries and territories of political, commercial, and economic national interest. This combination is clear in Mozambique’s Nacala Corridor where national mining and construction companies such as Vale, Odebrecht, and OAS are working with the support of BNDES (National Bank for Economic and Social Development), in the same territory where ProSavana is being implemented. In Angola, this is expressed in Odebrecht’s involvement with the PungoAdongo project in partnership with the Capanda Agroindustrial Center Development Society. Private interests can also be observed in cooperation agreements, like the one between the Brazilian Cooperation Agency (ABC) and the Getúlio Vargas Foundation (FGV-Agro), which aim to create ProSavana Master Plan and propose a structure for the Nacala Fund, and also in Embrapa’s role in transferring technologies that favors the engagement of the Brazilian private sector in African agriculture. It is worth noting the criticisms made by international movements and networks that characterize such initiatives as large land grabbing projects, the strongest one being the “NO to ProSavana” campaign.

vii. Combining South-South cooperation and regional integration in Latin America and the Caribbean

The recent expansion of Brazilian FNS cooperation in Latin America and the Caribbean is based on demands, projects, and initiatives that come mainly from regional integration dynamics and regional spaces.

The food question has always been central to development processes in most of Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) in a context characterized by intense poverty and

economic models that generate inequality. Attaining food security has been part of several national, sub-regional (Central America, Caribbean, and Andean Region), and continental (Latin American Integration Association – LAIA; Latin American Economic System – SELA) initiatives in past decades through a variety of concepts and approaches that, however, almost always emphasize agroindustrial sectors or references to poor individuals and families according to aspects of malnutrition. The cooperation and assistance projects that focused on “regional food security,” had little success that was limited to promoting trade. Part of a more recent trajectory is the unique Latin American characteristic of valuing the role of small farms, peasant and indigenous farming, and the recognition of family farming for domestic food supply, which is in permanent conflict with more hegemonic export-led strategies. The introduction of the nutrition dimension to the agendas is still very recent and secondary.

In the last decade there has been a re-focus on FNS in many LAC countries, mainly through regional blocs such as MERCOSUR, UNASUL, and CELAC, which are the result of the efforts of national governments, civil society networks and social movements, multilateral organizations like FAO, and even the concerted efforts of all these actors. The Brazilian FNS South-South cooperation in the LAC context occurs in the process of a series of regional integration dynamics produced in joint efforts between countries with historical ties to Brazil. Merging South-South cooperation and integration efforts seems to allow greater horizontal interaction and sustainability, a differentiating factor in relation to Brazilian cooperation in Africa.

The (re)approximation of Latin American countries has been favored by factors such as common process of re-democratization and reestablishment after the damages caused by dictatorships followed by neoliberal policies, and the defeat of the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA), followed by the creation of CELAC. The center-left tendencies of these governments and their convergence on the importance of active social policies – even though often used paradoxically in combination with conventional macroeconomic policies – created an environment that was favorable to FNS cooperation actions. The expansion of Brazilian cooperation in FNS in the region is largely based on demands that have been created in regional integration spaces the most significant ones being: the family farming agenda created by REAF, the FNS agenda under CELAC, and the cooperation agreement between the Brazilian government and FAO Chile for the promotion of FNS initiatives in the region, associated to the Hunger Free Latin America and Caribbean Initiative.

Additionally, there is an entire set of civil society networks in LAC that still need to be mapped and analyzed. These include the international work of the Brazilian Network for the Integration of Peoples (REBRIP), the Mercosur Confederation of Family Farmer Producer Organizations (COPROFAM), the Alliance for Food Sovereignty of the Peoples of LAC, the Latin American Parliamentary Front Against Hunger, as well as various social networks such as the ones gathering Amazon indigenous peoples and around agroecology.

viii. Innovations in the Brazilian South-South cooperation experience

In the transition from emergency food aid to cooperation aimed at structuring effective national FNS programmes, trilateral schemes with a intersectoral approach may be considered promissory cooperation innovations.

Here we find partnerships involving Brazilian institutions, the WFP, and FAO that are geared toward designing and implementing food acquisition from family farming programs and school meal programmes that incorporate purchasing directly from local producers. Both PAA and PNAE have increasingly served as inspiration and “best-practices” for designing these types of programs.

The transition from emergency food aid to technical cooperation programs is also seen in the afore-mentioned effort to renew Brazilian humanitarian cooperation through CGFome/MRE (General Coordination of International Action to Combat Hunger/Brazilian Ministry of Foreign Affairs), in search of a “sustainable humanitarian cooperation” model that intervenes in emergencies, as well as in the reconstruction of local food systems. The Food Acquisition Program in Africa (PAA-Africa) and the *LètAgogo* (institutional milk purchases) in Haiti are examples of this hybrid form of technical and humanitarian cooperation, and what makes them unique is that they purchase food locally.

As these new arrangements progress, it is worth noting the roles played by CGFome and the Center for Excellence Against Hunger, a Brazilian government partnership with the WFP.

ix. The absence of a national policy on South-South cooperation

Brazil does not have a South-South cooperation policy for development, per say, and neither does it have a clear cooperation strategy for FNS. This gives national actors ample space to work on a variety of fronts in conflicting and disconnected manners, often reproducing international tendencies that are damaging to FNS and the Human Right to Food.

International cooperation is the result of interacting ideas, institutions, and interests that encompass a set of concepts and practices that reflect parallel strategies enacted by different actors that are not always official foreign policy agencies, which can lead to a lack of coordination and real conflicts. Ministries, implementation agencies like the Brazilian Cooperation Agency (ABC), the Presidency of the Republic, the private sector, civil society organizations, international organizations, and traditional donors make up a very diverse set of actors that participate in development cooperation. This causes Brazilian South-South cooperation to respond to multiple interests in manners that are parallel and uncoordinated. Nevertheless, a cooperation policy that would allow greater coordination and monitoring should not mean losing the flexibility and autonomy that is necessary for sharing and disseminating unique practices and programs.

x. Spreading conflicting and contradictory perspectives

Brazil promotes distinct and contradictory domestic development models, especially in agriculture and rural fields, reproducing these same dilemmas and disputes in its South-South cooperation strategies.

Agricultural and agrarian issues dominate the international FNS agenda, which reflects the national contrast between agricultural models based on diversified family systems and the model based on large-scale patronal agriculture, meaning highly mechanized monocultures that rely heavily on chemical inputs. However, the political and economic influence of agribusiness on Brazilian national and foreign policies is reflected in its international cooperation, above all in Africa where Embrapa is the main cooperation instrument for this type of technology transfer. However, the pre-existing contradictions in the countries that receive Brazil's cooperation must also be considered in the analysis, since in most African countries national agricultural development strategies are based on increasing productivity and modernization paradigms, meaning they tend to be aligned with cooperation strategies associated to large-scale monoculture agriculture.

xi. The fragility of the institutional apparatus

The institutional apparatus of Brazilian cooperation is not sufficiently organized to keep up with its increasing international activities or to manage the demand for cooperation it receives.

The Brazilian Cooperation Agency (ABC) is limited to coordinating technical cooperation and managing demands, yet its institutional profile and attributions are not

strong enough to meet current cooperation needs. The General Coordination of International Action to Combat Hunger (CGFOME), which is associated to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MRE), coordinates the Brazilian government's international humanitarian cooperation with regards to FNS, however its efforts for combining humanitarian and technical cooperation are faced with limited and unstable human and financial resources.

In terms of implementing programs and projects, cooperation is the responsibility of a set of varied, mostly public and national institutions that work each according their own rationale with extremely little interaction in their different territories. Additionally, these institutions, like the ministries, are neither prepared nor equipped to respond to such demands. Most of the cooperation projects are conducted by expert groups from ministries and public enterprises that are directly involved in implementing programs at national levels. Cooperation work usually comes as extra work for which personnel are not properly trained. There are also various international organizations working as facilitators or articulators of Brazilian technical and humanitarian cooperation, which helps both disseminate the Brazilian experience and ensure that food aid is delivered to countries in situations of emergency or calamity. All the humanitarian aid projects coordinated by CGFOME are executed in partnership with agencies from the UN System.

In terms of technical cooperation, FAO and the United Nations World Food Program (WFP) joined forces to implement government food purchasing programs. Most of the FNS cooperation projects are about dimensions of production and access to food. There is a notable lack of projects that deal with the specific needs of indigenous peoples, *quilombolas*², and other traditional communities. This absence is more conspicuous when considering that Africa and Latin America are taken as cooperation priorities, where there is enormous potential for exchanging culture and traditions related to food practices and production.

xii. Limited transparency and lack of social participation mechanisms

Brazilian South-South cooperation lacks transparency and has no formal participation mechanisms in Brazil or in the countries it cooperates with.

There are two initiatives in the field of FNS that are noted for their efforts to open possibilities in this area. One is CONSEA, whose work to support an international agenda has already been mentioned, and the other is the Permanent Committee of International

² 'Quilombolas' are descendants of Afro-Brazilian slaves that runaway and created their own rural communities called 'Quilombos'.

Affairs (CPAI), which is part of the National Council for Sustainable Rural Development (CONDRAF) that seeks to discuss cooperation projects like *Mais Alimentos* and *ProSavana*. Although these initiatives are important, they are isolated and do not allow for broad intersectoral and systemic discussions about the priorities and strategies in Brazilian cooperation. The lack of institutional dialogues coupled with inadequate systematized information that is neither transparent nor freely accessed contributes to generating mistrust and criticisms. In order to share cooperation actions with the public and promote accountability, CGFOME has been developing its own information system called System for Managing, Monitoring, and Evaluating Brazilian Humanitarian Actions (SIGMA), which is an initiative that must be valued.

Social participation is also limited by the fact that SSC is still not a meaningful debate on the agenda of social movements and other Brazilian civil society organizations and networks. Nevertheless, the work of Via Campesina and the participation of CONTAG in Mercosur are worth noting. In general South South cooperation is usually associated to internationalizing Zero Hunger and the idea of “exporting contradictions”, which is the result of the previously mentioned conflicting initiatives. In countries that receive cooperation, the lack of transparency and participation has been criticized, especially in large programs like ProSavana that are highly capable of interfering in agrarian structures and policies in nations with fragile democracies.

xiii. Issues raised by policy dissemination and transfer

The main technical cooperation projects in agriculture and FNS are transfers and adaptations of national FNS programmes. It is worth questioning whether the premises of similarities and horizontality are sustainable given the significant differences between Brazil and most of the countries it cooperates with.

The current context requires reviewing the perspective of policy transfer that underlies numerous cooperation projects, which involve a complex process of choices, interpretations, adaptations, and above all, frequent mediation. Disseminating or transferring policies through cooperation implies de-contextualizing ideas, practices, and institutions and submit them to the specific dynamics of the receiving country. Thus it is important to look at the new cooperation’s institutional arrangements and the networks of agents that are being formed. It is worth noting the applicability of the two most important characteristics of Brazilian FNS policies in distinct socio-institutional contexts, which are the intersectoral approach, and social participation. Cooperation projects risk ignoring the fact that the success of Brazilian policies is due to the combination of a set of programmes. The

lack of effective participation from local society is another factor that may distort one of the essential components of the models that are transferred and adapted. The most significant cases are the projects that purchase directly from family farming using the PAA and PNAE models. The “non-interference” principle and the Brazilian approach of conducting “cooperation upon demand” restrict the inclusion of participatory democracy requirements that would favor social participation in the projects, especially in the case of partner countries marked by weak democracies and low levels of social organization.

Discussion points and recommendations for building a public agenda

This section presents some discussion points and recommendations for building an international agenda on FNSS and RtF for both FBSSAN and CONSEA, the latter involving a joint effort between civil society and government. What follows are three main challenges related to Brazilian South-South cooperation in these fields that were identified as the research progressed and in the debates with social actors promoted by the project.

i. Agreeing on a Brazilian policy for South-South cooperation and configure and intersectoral institutionality

The studies and debates that were conducted demonstrated the need to agree upon cooperation principles to serve as the foundation for implanting the appropriate institutionality and structures for managing Brazilian South-South cooperation in general, and in FNSS and RTF areas specifically. A conceptual agreement should be made by creating a new legal framework along with venues and mechanisms for coordinating cooperation able to deal with the multiple actors and the fragmented and dispersed initiatives that characterize Brazilian technical and humanitarian cooperation without compromising the autonomy of the different initiatives and implementing agencies. Such an effort would include at least the following points: i) establish general guiding principles for cooperation; ii) design a national cooperation policy for South-South cooperation; iii) create venues and mechanisms to guarantee transparency and social participation; iv) implement appropriate administrative procedures and mechanisms that expand the capacity of cooperation and shared decisions between various implementing agencies; v) allocate sufficient budgetary resources; vi) protect and enforce universal human rights; vii) create guidelines for the complex relationships between international development

cooperation, the national interests expressed in foreign and trade policies, and the initiatives of the private sector.

The proposal to create a National Council on Foreign Policy has gained momentum in foreign policy debates, in that it could, among other things, serve as a venue for mediation and social participation for Brazilian South-South cooperation.

ii. Design a South-South cooperation strategy for food and nutrition security and sovereignty and for the human right to food

In a dispersed context where cooperation initiatives do not communicate with each other, and at times even contradict each other in their objectives, and where scarce resources accentuate the need to establish priorities, it is necessary to consider designing a Brazilian strategy for South-South FNSS cooperation. This instrument should be based on the principles of food sovereignty and the human right to adequate food, as well as other precepts that guide the National Policy for Food and Nutrition Security such as intersectoral approaches and social participation. It would have the direct involvement of various implementing organizations and of the National Council for Food and Nutrition Security (CONSEA), in light of the experience it has accumulated over recent years.

The international recognition of the Zero Hunger strategy as a reference for public policies seeking to guarantee RTF is an opportunity for government and nongovernment actors involved in building FNS national policies to assess their experiences and share their conclusions through Brazilian South-South cooperation, since most of the countries receiving cooperation are currently in the process of implementing their national strategies. Such an effort must consider the complexity of diffusing the set of elements that make up the Brazilian strategy and its systemic, participative, and intersectoral perspective. Reflecting on the best strategy for sharing this experience in light of the issues raised by public policy transfers certainly contradicts the cooperation logic based on time-limited projects adopted so far.

Among the concerns and recommendations to be considered in such a strategy are:

1. Instead of exporting public policy designs and models, adopt the principle of horizontal relationships that values exchanging and sharing experiences while designing and implementing cooperation programmes. Greater flexibility and local empowerment are some factors that may facilitate the adaptation process. Stimulating cooperation and dialogue between civil society entities and not denying the debate of contradictions the model itself

presents, as in the case of ProSavana, are fundamental for producing more horizontal relationships, both among governments and civil society

2. Deepen the debate about the concept of “sustainable humanitarian cooperation” and its relationship with technical cooperation as a way of dissolving the boundaries between them, thus creating a new cooperation paradigm, especially adequate to the African context, marked by the transition from international humanitarian aid to locally purchasing food and the consolidation of FNS national policies.. Brazilian SSC could be strategic to countries that are facing the challenge of reducing their dependence on resources from development cooperation and of becoming increasingly more autonomous in operating their own budgets and public policy systems.

3. Value and explore the accumulated learning experiences gained from technical cooperation experiences that have a more intersectoral perspective such as: the cooperation agreement with FAO Chile to support national and sub-regional FNS strategies for in Latin America and the Caribbean (FAO/Brazil), and the Center for Excellence Against Hunger (WFP/Brazil). These initiatives have great potential for both diffusion and mutual learning from the perspective of greater horizontality.

4. Question projects that EMBRAPA currently regards as structuring models for South-South cooperation, such as ProSavana. These large scale projects created in upper decision-making arenas through triangular schemes with countries from the North, have strong impacts on the livelihoods of local communities, and do not incorporate proper dialogues and public consultation with local and national civil society. Furthermore, they are clearly associated with commercial interests instead of the most eminent need of guaranteeing food rights.

5. Value and prioritize cooperation demands that result from official movements and initiatives conducted by regional groups such as CPLP and REAF/MERCOSUL, whose roles in consolidating a sustainable and continued process of strengthening FNSS and family farming agendas must be recognized.

iii. Promote social participation

The dilemmas of social participation can be seen as a double challenge. On one hand it is important to ensure the participation of Brazilian civil society in the design and monitoring of SSC strategies, while on the other hand facing the challenge of promoting social participation in the countries receiving cooperation. We have seen that this second perspective depends essentially on the national realities found in the recipient countries and the government willingness and capacity to mobilize their respective civil society organizations. In both cases, Brazilian civil society may play a central role and must be strengthened in order to intervene effectively and be able to interact with organizations and movements in partner countries. The lack of unity and political coordination within these movements and organizations, coupled with scarce or nonexistent financial resources to bridge cooperation ties.

Some proposals toward this end are:

1. Conduct social monitoring of international cooperation actions within the framework of the human right to adequate food, and create a specific venue dedicated to this objective in the proposed National Council on Foreign Policy.
2. Define social participation as a guiding principle for a public policy proposal for Brazilian South-South cooperation
3. Ensure the participation of civil society on both sides in developing cooperation projects.
4. Foster greater transparency and accountability in cooperation where it is the federal government's responsibility to systematically collect, organize, and distribute data and analyses about international cooperation activities for monitoring and evaluation purposes.
5. Establish mechanisms and ways for exchanging experiences between Brazilian civil society and partner countries as components that are inherent to cooperation projects, especially in cases of policies and experiences built on principles of participation, thus the importance of CGFOME's efforts and budget allocations for this specific use.
6. Guarantee that member-states will support the Mechanism to Facilitate Civil Society Participation in the CONSAN/CPLP and in Family Agriculture work group, since this is the only mechanism that, despite its limitations, allows ongoing permanent social participation.

6. Strengthen international and autonomous social organizations, networks, and associations so that movements can work together in resisting food rights violations associated to Brazilian cooperation, as well as in the creation of positive agendas.
7. Ensure that in international forums discussing issues related to the nutrition agenda, the coordination and implementation of policies are stated, and accompanied by effective social participation.
8. Business sector participation in decision-making processes and in the implementation of international and national strategies and policies should be prohibited.

iv. Transparency and knowledge production

The lack of transparency and knowledge production related to Brazilian South-South FNS cooperation weakens the conditions for social participation and monitoring. The debate is still highly influenced by North-South cooperation references. Therefore, there is a need for more studies and analyses to understand how Brazilian cooperation projects perform when the counterparts meet, keeping in mind both the plans and priorities of the countries receiving the cooperation and the demands and criticisms of local civil society. This is important in that it:

- i) questions and qualifies the debate about the so-called “exportation of internal contradictions”;
- ii) helps understand how civil societies in partner countries perceive Brazilian cooperation and its impacts, as well as their understanding about real participation and intersectoral perspectives;
- iii) analyzes the principles that drive South-South cooperation, specifically the notion of cooperation upon demand, solidarity diplomacy, non-association to commercial and for-profit interests, non-interference in domestic issues, horizontal relationships and mutual learning.

Mapping civil society participation in at least three areas of the international FNSS and RTF agenda is strategic to better understanding their movements:

- i) technical cooperation between movements and organizations based on exchanging alternative experiences in areas such as agroecology, and native seed banks;

- ii) organization of regional campaigns such as the Campaign Against Agrichemicals And For Life, or the campaign against transgenic;
- iii) activities to impact or resist in light of international treaties and multinational public and private dynamics, which include the Alliance for Food Sovereignty of the Peoples of Latin American and the Caribbean (The New Alliance).

This mapping may also help to identify gaps that must be filled, such as the absence of women and references to gender in articulations, or the proper recognition of initiatives such as the Rural Women Forum (CPLP).

Finally, there is an entire field of concerns in terms of the cooperation-investment-financing triad, especially with regards to the combined efforts of governments and private sectors, which bring up concerns about certain cooperation schemes that have allegedly violated food sovereignty and RtF. Here we also identify the need for a more general reflection on public-private partnerships and the relationships between cooperation and foreign and trade policies.