



International Indian Treaty Council

Information Office
2940 16th Street, Suite 305,
San Francisco, CA 94103-3664
Telephone: (415) 641-4482
Fax: (415) 641-1298
email to: iitc@treatycouncil.org

Administration Office
456 N. Alaska Street
Palmer, AK 99645
Telephone: (907) 745-4482
Fax: (907) 745-4484
email to: andrea@treatycouncil.org



United Nation Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues

Ninth Session 19 – 29 April 2010

United Nations Headquarters, New York

Agenda item: Indigenous Peoples: Development with Culture and Identity, Articles 3 and 32 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

Co-Submitted by the International Indian Treaty Council (IITC) and the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)

Final Report to the UNPFII: “Field Testing the Cultural Indicators for Food Security, Food Sovereignty and Sustainable Development in Indigenous Communities”

“This training was like planting a seed which can grow into something strong and good for our community”.

- Yaqui Elder, Rio Yaqui, Sonora Mexico, Cultural Indicators Field Testing and Training Workshop, November 22nd, 2008

“I spoke to my nephew last night regarding deer hunting. He stated that he has not seen any in the fields or even on the roads! We feel the loss for our brothers and sisters in nature.”

- Cree Elder, Cultural Indicators Field Testing and Training Workshop, Beaver Lake Cree Nation, Alberta Canada, January 22nd, 2009

I. Introduction

The “*Cultural Indicators for Food Security, Food Sovereignty and Sustainable Development*” were finalized at the **2nd Global Consultation on Right to Food, Food Security and Food Sovereignty for Indigenous Peoples** (September 2006, Bilwi Nicaragua). They were result of several years of work by IITC working with Indigenous organizations, traditional grass roots Indigenous food producers and knowledge holders from around the world as well as the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and its Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development (“SARD”) Initiative. They focus on the inextricable link between the traditional Indigenous food systems and the bio-cultural relationships, understandings and practices upon which they are based.

The “Cultural Indicators” provide a framework and practical tool for Indigenous Peoples to assess and measure the positive and negative effects of programs, methods and technologies coming from outside their communities and environmental impacts such as mining and climate change, as well as the vitality and resiliency of traditional practices and methods and their ability to transmit them to new generations. They also reflect, demonstrate and underscore the inextricable links between human rights, in particular self-determination and free prior and informed consent, access to traditional lands and natural resources and the vitality of cultural and biological diversity.

From October 2007 – February 2010, the IITC, in conjunction with hosting Indigenous communities and organizations, carried out a “field testing” program focused on presenting, disseminating, providing training and “field testing” the implementation of the Cultural Indicators. Over 450 Indigenous representatives from 66 Indigenous communities and Peoples from 5 countries/territories participated in 10 1 – 2 day workshops and training sessions focusing on implementing the Cultural Indicators. Many participants were designated representatives of their Indigenous organizations and communities who brought information and responses from previous collective discussions into the field testing process. In the responses of the 216 participants who completed and submitted evaluation questionnaires from these workshops, a total of 10,085 community members were reported to be represented.

Presentations and trainings were also provided to a number of UN bodies and fora, development agencies, foundations and NGOs during this time.

Throughout this “field testing” process, the Cultural Indicators continued to demonstrate their utility as a useful framework and practical tool for Indigenous Peoples to assess and measure the positive and negative impacts of programs, development projects and technologies from both outside and within their communities, and to focus attention on areas of most urgent concerns threatening their food sovereignty. They also were able to provide an effective framework for collective discussions which lead to the development of community-based initiatives addressing threats and strengthening traditional systems.

It is important to note that the discussion and sharing of specific traditional knowledge and practices which took place during these workshops among and between the participating community members, including many traditional knowledge holders and traditional spiritual/cultural leaders and prisoners, is assured to remain in the hands of these communities themselves, to share (or not) as they so chose. The details of traditional knowledge and practices that were shared and discussed during this process were never intended to, nor will it be included in any of IITC’s report on the cultural indicators process. This report is intended to highlight the primary issues and areas of concerns that were the focus of the discussions during the workshops, as well as the effectiveness and utility of the process itself, as reflected in the responses of participants as reported below.

The most urgent and consistent concerns of the participating communities from all regions have continued to be environmental impacts on traditional foods and ecosystems of mining, pesticide use, damming, deforestation and climate change, as well as issues and impacts related to denial of land and water rights. Other areas of key interest and attention among the participants included the vitality and resiliency of, and threats to, traditional practices and methods for food production as well as the transmission of food-related knowledge to new generations. Participants also

consistently underscored the essential importance and continued relevancy of a “human rights” approach including Free Prior and Informed Consent, Self-Determination, Cultural Rights and Rights to Land, Territories and Resources. And they continued to affirm the vital interconnections of cultural and biological diversity as the foundations for Food Security and Food Sovereignty for Indigenous Peoples.

II. Background: Development of the “Cultural Indicators”

The issues of sustainable development and food security have been a priority focus for IITC and its affiliates for many years, working in Indigenous communities as well as within international bodies such as the UN Commission on Sustainable Development and the UN Food and Agriculture Organization’s SARD Initiative, where IITC has served as the “Indigenous Focal Point” organization for the past several years.

A key and unprecedented achievement resulting from the evolving collaboration between the IITC and FAO was the **First Global Summit on the Right to Food and Food Security for Indigenous Peoples in Guatemala (April 2002)**, attended by over 125 Indigenous delegates from 28 countries in every region of the world. The **“Declaration of Atitlán,”** which addresses the links between human rights and economic development and the protection of local livelihoods, food systems and cultures, was adopted by consensus.

The Declaration of Atitlan reaffirmed the essential cultural value of Indigenous Peoples’ agriculture and other traditional food systems and the important role of Indigenous cultural understandings and ceremonial practices in maintaining these systems. It also identified obstacles and laid out multi-level recommendations to ensure Indigenous Peoples’ Food Security and Food Sovereignty on the local, national and international levels. The Declaration of Atitlan continues to be reaffirmed and endorsed by many Indigenous conferences and at a range of international gatherings as a major, historic collective policy statement by and for Indigenous Peoples on Food Security and Right to Food.

In 2002, IITC agreed to coordinate another Indigenous consultation process with FAO focusing on development of “cultural indicators” as a component of global food security policies and a mechanism for technical guidance of FAO’s programs. The primary methodology selected by IITC was the dissemination of a questionnaire survey at various gatherings as well as via e-mail and the Internet. Due to resource limitations, the primary focus was on outreach and dissemination in the Americas (North, Central and South). However responses were also submitted by Indigenous Peoples, communities and organizations from the Africa, Pacific, Caribbean and Arctic Regions.

The IITC received 128 completed responses from Indigenous communities, organizations and community practitioners from 29 countries to its **“Traditional Culture and Right to Food Questionnaire”**. The responses overwhelmingly underscored the vital direct relationship between traditional foods and community cultural practices for Indigenous Peoples in all regions. It also provided a basis for assessing the Indigenous participants’ experiences with current and past development projects, noting the impacts and outcomes, as well as identifying the planning, evaluation and consultation processes that were (or were not) conducted in their territories.

This was an important step and an historic opportunity to re-define global agrarian and economic frameworks by affirming the human rights and cultural aspects of food security. It also began to assess the negative impacts of imposed development on Indigenous cultures and food systems taking into consideration the perspectives of Indigenous communities. This was an urgent need identified by the Indigenous Peoples working on this process, and was also recognized by UN FAO and other international bodies and agencies.

IITC's assessment of the questionnaire responses provided a framework of common concerns and issue areas ("themes") as a basis for the next steps in the development of "**Cultural Indicators**". It identified common problems and harmful activities impacting Indigenous Peoples' traditional foods, cultures and subsistence practices. These include policies limiting land/water rights and access, introduction of new types of foods and methods including GMO's, large-scale (industrial) farming methods, introduction of development programs without community consultation and consent, ecosystem and habitat destruction, and erosion of traditional knowledge and practices including their transmission to new generations.

III. The 2nd Global Consultation on the Right to Food, Food Security and Food Sovereignty for Indigenous Peoples

From September 7 – 9, 2006, 20 Indigenous experts including rights activists, community leaders and traditional food producers from 6 regions (North America, Latin America, Africa, Asia, Pacific, Arctic), as well as various members of the local community, met in Bilwi, Nicaragua for the **2nd Global Consultation on the Right to Food, Food Security and Food Sovereignty for Indigenous Peoples**. Representatives of UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) SARD Initiative, UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), UN Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) and the UN Development Programme (UNDP) also actively participated in this historic gathering and committed to disseminate and apply the results.

The focus and goal of the Consultation was to share experiences and build on previous work to finalize "**Cultural Indicators for Food Security, Food Sovereignty and Sustainable Development**" as a practical tool for assessment of programs, policies and practices being carried out by UN Agencies and bodies, development institutions, funding agencies and NGO's as well as by Indigenous communities.

The Consultation was coordinated by the IITC as the Indigenous Focal Point Organization with the FAO's SARD Initiative. The completion of the "**Cultural Indicators for Food Security, Food Sovereignty and Sustainable Development**" has been hailed by many involved agencies and Indigenous organizations as an historic breakthrough achievement in the development of Indicators for sustainable development that take into account the concerns, cultural perspectives, priorities for development and rights of Indigenous Peoples.

A "Framework" including the following underlining Principles and Criteria c for the development of the Cultural Indicators was agreed on by consensus of the participants at the 2nd Global Consultation:

A. Underlying Principles for Cultural Indicators for Food Sovereignty:

1. Based on the definition of food Sovereignty as a prerequisite for Food Security for Indigenous Peoples as defined in the Declaration of Atitlan:

“Food Sovereignty is the right of Peoples to define their own policies and strategies for the sustainable production, distribution, and consumption of food, with respect for their own cultures and their own systems of managing natural resources and rural areas, and is considered to be a precondition for Food Security”

2. Based on the Rights of Self Determination, Free, Prior and Informed Consent and full and effective participation of Indigenous Peoples at all stages.

3. Based on and inextricably linked to Indigenous Peoples’ right to lands, territories and natural resources.

4. Based on implementing real partnership efforts between Indigenous Peoples, key UN agencies (in particular, FAO, UNDP, UNPFII, WHO), States, NGO’s, agencies, etc. as underscored in the 1st and 2nd UN Declarations for the International Decades.

5. Based on recognition of the common concerns and perspectives among all Indigenous Peoples as well as respect for the unique, distinct situations and needs of each Indigenous Peoples and each region.

6. Based on the recognition that the Right to Food, Food Security and Subsistence are fundamental inherent human rights of Indigenous Peoples and all Peoples, as is the right of Indigenous Peoples to set their own priorities for their development.

B. Criteria for Cultural Indicators

1. They have a food sovereignty focus, in particular relating to the relationship between food sovereignty and traditional culture

2. They are practical, useful and measurable

3. They should be broad enough to be applied in a range of regions and situations (where they could be made more specific and detailed if need be)

4. They can be used to measure trends and changes (increases and decreases over time)

5. They use the model proposed that includes under each theme structural, process and results indicators.

6. They reflect Indigenous Peoples’ input and direct involvement in development, planning, data collection, analysis and follow-up activities.

7. They take into account the role and contributions of Indigenous men and women, youth and elders

8. They include the collection of anecdotal data, oral histories, interviews and other information provided by traditional practitioners, producers, elders and other community members, as well as from other sources (studies, testing, statistics, etc)

C. The definition of Development to be used in the context of Cultural Indicators

“Development with identity is the project of life of the Indigenous Peoples based on their own logic and worldview. It is the natural growth of Indigenous Peoples, of their flora and of their fauna based on principles of self-determination in relation to land, territories, and natural resources. It is also respect for their individual and collective rights. It is the welfare and security of our peoples.”

IV. The “Cultural Indicators for Food Security, Food Sovereignty and Sustainable Development”

At the 2nd Global Consultation, two sets of indicators were developed at the request of UN FAO and by agreement of the participants. One contained indicators under each of the 11 thematic areas developed by consensus of the Indigenous participants (3 areas were added to the original framework of 8 which resulted from analysis of responses to the questionnaire disseminated in 2002-2003).

The 11 thematic areas, which have continued to be used by IITC in the field-testing workshops in Indigenous communities, are as follows:

- 1) Access to, security for and integrity of lands, territories and natural resources for traditional food production, harvesting and/or gathering**
- 2) Abundance, scarcity and/or threats to traditional seeds, plant foods and medicines, and food animals, as well as cultural practices associated with their protection and survival**
- 3) Consumption and preparation of traditional plant and animal foods and medicines, including in ceremonial/cultural use as well as daily household use**
- 4) Continued practice and use of ceremonies, dances, prayers, songs and stories and other cultural traditions related to the use of traditional foods and subsistence practices**
- 5) Preservation and continued use of language and traditional names for foods and processes (planting, hunting, gathering, harvesting, fishing, food preparation etc.)**
- 6) Integrity of and access to sacred sites for ceremonial purposes related to use of traditional foods**
- 7) Migration and movement away from traditional lands as a result of rural-to-urban migration, conflict, forced relocation, land appropriation, climate change, and economic necessity; return patterns and relationships to continued use of traditional foods.**

- 8) Effective consultations for planning, implementation and evaluation applying the principles of Free, Prior Informed Consent and full participation by community members when development programs are implemented by states, outside agencies or other entities and the extent to which cultural concerns are considered and addressed.**
- 9) Existence and viability of mechanisms and institutions created by and accessible to Indigenous Peoples for transmission of food related traditional knowledge and practices to future generations**
- 10) Capacity within Indigenous communities and Peoples for adaptability, resilience, resistance and/or restoration of traditional food use and production in response to changing economic, political and/ or environmental conditions**
- 11) Ability of Indigenous Peoples to utilize and implement recognized rights, legal norms and standards as well as self-government structures to promote and defend their Food Sovereignty on the local/tribal/community, national and international levels**

The second format represented a more streamlined version with these 11 thematic areas consolidated into 5 broader areas with indicators under each. It was the view of the FAO/SARD representatives that this consolidated version of the indicators might be more practical for use and application by agencies and international institutions.

The innovative 3-part model for each theme area used in both formats was adopted by the Indigenous participants in the Consultation to encompass a range of activities as well as to measure impacts and changes over time, is now being widely duplicated (“Structural Indicators, Process Indicators and Results Indicators” under each theme area).

The final “Cultural Indicators” document reporting the results of the 2006 2nd Global Consultation contains and explains both the expanded and the consolidated formats, and has been widely circulated. It has been disseminated by the UN Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) and the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, and has been presented to those agencies as well as to the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), UN Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) and the UN Development Programme (UNDP), IFAD, the CBD, the Office of the UN High Commissioner on Human Rights, FONGI, the World Conservation Union (IUCN), Heifer International and First Peoples Development Institute/First Peoples Worldwide and Tebtebba Foundation among others. It has also been submitted upon request to the UN Special Rapporteurs on Indigenous Issues and on the Right to Food, and to Universidad Autónoma Nacional de México (UNAM) in Mexico City.

IITC also co-authored, with FAO/SARD, an academic analysis of the relationship between traditional cultures and local Indigenous food systems, and an assessment of the development and application of the Cultural Indicators, *“Cultural Indicators of Indigenous Peoples' food and agro-ecological systems”* (2007, Ellen Woodley with Eve Crowley, Andrea Carmen, et al). It has been widely posted and disseminated by FAO and other UN agencies as a means to build understanding about and promote the utility of the Cultural Indicators, highlighting the work of IITC and Indigenous Peoples in this regard. A policy brief [E/C.19/2009/CRP. 3, 17 February 2009] was also submitted as Conference Room Paper jointly by IITC and FAO for the UNPFII

8th session, and is posted the web page of the UNPFII:

http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/E_C_19_2009_CRP3_en.pdf

The complete report from the 2nd Global Consultation with the comprehensive list of the “*Field Testing the Cultural Indicators for Food Security, Food Sovereignty and Sustainable Development in Indigenous Communities*” is available on IITC’s Web page (www.treatycouncil.org) in both English and Spanish. It is also available in a publication by the Tebtebba Foundation “*Indicators Relevant for Indigenous Peoples: A resource book*” now available in print and on line in Spanish and English via www.tebtebba.org.

V. “Field Testing” the Indicators: Activities and Outcomes

From October 2007- March 2010, ten in-depth 1 - 2 day training workshops focused on implementing and using the Cultural Indicators were carried out in Indigenous communities in 8 distinct bio-cultural regions (5 countries/territories), with the participations of over 500 participants from 66 different Indigenous Peoples and communities. These were:

- **Ejido Gabriel Leyva Solano, Sinaloa Mexico (Yoremes Unidos del Municipio de Ahome, A.C.), October 2007**
 - **Chimaltenango Guatemala (June 2008, with participants from Mayan organizations and communities, as well as Indigenous representatives from Panama, Puerto Rico and Mexico)**
 - **Vicam Rio Yaqui Sonora México (November, 2008)**
 - **Predio San Antonio y Ejido Iztatal, Santo Domingo Zanatepec, Oaxaca del Pueblo Indígena zoque-gulucheno, Mexico (December 2008)**
 - **Beaver Lake Cree Nation, Alberta Canada (January, 2009)**
 - **Ya Ne Dah Ah Tribal School (K – 12), Chickaloon, Alaska (February 2009)**
 - **Atlacholoaya, Morelos, Mexico (July 2009)**
 - **Bilwi, Nicaragua (October 2009)**
 - **White Earth Reservation (February 2010)**
 - **Chickaloon Village Traditional Council (February 2010)**
1. Questionnaires were completed, received and compiled from 216 participants at 9 of these workshops, with official representation reflecting the input and consultation of 10,085 persons.
 2. Several hundred (800 +) additional indigenous participants from around the world also attended Indigenous workshops and conferences where the Cultural Indicators were presented by IITC in conjunction with other themes and presentations (i.e. on Food Security/Food Sovereignty, Indicators of Well Being and the MDG's, Biological Diversity, Sustainable Development, Climate Change, Restoration of Traditional Seeds, Human Rights and other related issues). These include Indigenous conferences in Xela Guatemala (Human Rights and FPIC, March 2009); Anchorage Alaska (Indigenous Peoples Global Summit on Climate Change, April 2009); the 35th annual International Indian Treaty Conference (Ustupu Panama, August 2009); a community training on Pesticides, Food Sovereignty and Right to Water (Vicam Sonora Mexico, November 2009) the 2nd Latin American Indigenous Peoples

Summit on Climate Change (Lima, January 2010, rescheduled from November 2009); the 7th an Indigenous Farming and Food sovereignty conference (February 2010, White Earth Reservation, Minnesota) and at various other International indigenous events throughout the grant year.

1. The Cultural Indicators were also presented and disseminated to a number of UN bodies and agencies, including the UNPFII, member states and NGO's working in support of sustainable development and food security, as well as the advancement and implementation of "indicators of well being" from the perspective of Indigenous Peoples. These included UN FAO at various conferences and meetings, IFAD, the CBD, the United Nations Human Rights Council, the Office of the High Commission on Human Rights (Study on Human Rights and Climate Change), the UN Human Rights Council (panels on Right to Food and Climate Change), Fordham University (Conference on Human Rights and Climate Change, the UN Rapporteurs on Indigenous Issues and Right to Food, the High Commissioner on Human Rights, the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM), the Social Responsible Investors Annual Conference, the Calvert Group, Heifer International, Catholic Social Services and First Peoples Worldwide, Comision de Pueblos Indigenas del Foro de ONGs Internacionales (Forum of International NGO's Commission on Indigenous Peoples – FONGI, Guatemala) and the Autonomous University (UNAM), Mexico City. Some of these have stated their interest and commitment to utilize and disseminate the Cultural Indicator to assess their impacts of their own programs and projects in Indigenous Communities.
2. Follow-up consultations were provided to a number of tribes, communities and organizations to address specific areas of concern, upon their request.
3. A training format and presentation/training materials developed and used for the first time in Guatemala in June 2008. It continued to be updated, used and widely disseminated in 2009 - 2010. The training format and associated educational materials were provided to hosting and participating organizations and communities, and will continue to be used by "trainees" to carry out other trainings in their own communities. These include the evaluation questionnaire, sample agendas, 4 "power points" in English and Spanish updated with results from trainings, compiled questionnaire responses and examples provided by participants with their agreement. A new brochure "Food Sovereignty in Indigenous Communities" began to be used in October 2009 in Spanish and English.
4. IITC coordinated a panel presentation and side event, co-sponsored by the UNPFII Secretariat and FAO, at the 8th session of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous issues (April 2009), to present the preliminary results of the Indicators field testing project. Results were compiled and presented in a conference room paper at UNPFII8, along with an assessment and analysis. The final report is being presented at the UNPFII 9th (April 2010), and a side event is also planned for more in depth discussion.
5. As a direct result of ongoing community discussions following up on the initial trainings, several new programs and initiatives were developed by individual and/groups of communities as a result of assenting needs and threats using the Cultural Indicators. Examples included: a project to gathering and use traditional knowledge in response to

climate change reestablishing the use of drought resistant traditional seeds and rain water collection methods (Rio Yaqui Sonora Mexico); building a major campaign now underway in Guatemala to oppose the distribution of genetically modified foods; and implementation of a program to transmit traditional knowledge about wild plant gathering methods and related cultural practices from tribal elders to youth (Chickaloon Village, Yah Ne Dah Ah Tribal School, Alaska). Indigenous Peoples from around the world also made a collective call to UNFAO to create a working group on Indigenous Peoples, Food Sovereignty and Climate Change, formally presented to FAO by IITC at the UNPFII 8th session (May 2009, NY, letter presented to FAO's Secretary Geneva). A lawsuit was also filed by Beaver Lake Cree Nation in Canada calling for a halt of the tar sands development in Northern Alberta Canada addressing, among other issues the impacts on their hunting, fishing and gathering rights as guaranteed to them in perpetuity under Treaty No. 6.

6. The Cultural Indicators took on a growing importance in the area of Indigenous Peoples' food systems and the impacts, adaptations and solutions to Climate Change, using in particular, Indicator area # 10 ***“Capacity within Indigenous communities and Peoples for adaptability, resilience, resistance and/or restoration of traditional food use and production in response to changing economic, political and/or environmental conditions”***. As a member of the International Steering Committee for the Indigenous Peoples' Global Summit on Climate Change (April 2009, Anchorage Alaska) the IITC coordinated the theme area related to impacts Food Sovereignty and related cultural practices, as well as resiliency and adaptation to Climate Change based on traditional food related knowledge and practices, including use of the Cultural Indicators in this regard. The final "Anchorage Declaration" from the Summit included the following paragraphs which were developed and submitted by the participants in this theme area's breakout sessions:

13. In order to provide the resources necessary for our collective survival in response to the climate crisis, we declare our communities, waters, air, forests, oceans, sea ice, traditional lands and territories to be “Food Sovereignty Areas,” defined and directed by Indigenous Peoples according to customary laws, free from extractive industries, deforestation and chemical-based industrial food production systems (i.e. contaminants, agro-fuels, genetically modified organisms).

14. We encourage our communities to exchange information while ensuring the protection and recognition of and respect for the intellectual property rights of Indigenous Peoples at the local, national and international levels pertaining to our Traditional Knowledge, innovations, and practices. These include knowledge and use of land, water and sea ice, traditional agriculture, forest management, ancestral seeds, pastoralism, food plants, animals and medicines and are essential in developing climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies, restoring our food sovereignty and food independence, and strengthening our Indigenous families and nations.

VI. Compiled Results: The “Field Testing” Questionnaire Responses, 2008- 2010

A Total of 216 surveys were submitted by the participants in the 9 training/field testing workshops listed below. Some participants chose not to complete or submit these questionnaires and some who turned them in did not answer all of the questions, which accounts for the discrepancies in some of the totals in each section. The first field testing workshop in Sinaloa Mexico (October 2007) is not included among the responses, as the questionnaire was not yet developed at that time. However, the discussions and input of participants from several Indigenous communities in Mexico who attended that workshop assisted IITC greatly in the development of the field testing questionnaire and other training materials used at subsequent community trainings this composite survey represents the responses received from participants in field testing workshops held in the following communities:

- **Chimaltenango Guatemala (June 2008, with participants from Mayan organizations and communities, as well as Indigenous representatives from Panama, Puerto Rico and Mexico)**
- **Vicam Rio Yaqui Sonora México (November, 2008)**
- **Predio San Antonio y Ejido Iztatal, Santo Domingo Zanatepec, Oaxaca del Pueblo Indígena Zoque-gulucheno, Mexico (December 2008)**
- **Beaver Lake Cree Nation, Alberta Canada (January, 2009)**
- **Chickaloon Village/Ya Ne Dah Ah Tribal School, Chickaloon, Alaska (February 2009)**
- **Atlacholaya, Morelos, Mexico (July 2009)**
- **Bilwi, Nicaragua (October 2009)**
- **White Earth Reservation (February 2010)**
- **Chickaloon Village Traditional Council (February 2019)**

Many of the participants were designated representatives of communities and organizations who had discussed and considered the issues to be discussed previously. Based on the reports provided by the participants, the input of a total of 10,085 community members were represented in the information and responses compiled in these questionnaires.

“Indigenous Peoples’ Right to Food Using Cultural Indicators as a Community Assessment Tool to Defend Our Food Sovereignty”

Questionnaire Assessment and Evaluation Results (216 total responses compiled)

1. How important is the issue of food sovereignty/food security to your organization/ community?

- 199 very important
- 8 important
- 4 somewhat important
- 1 not important
- 0 don't know

2. What impact has participating in this process to apply the “*Cultural Indicators for Food Security, Food Sovereignty and Sustainable Development*” had had in your community?

- 166 very significant impact
- 31 significant impact
- 6 somewhat significant
- 0 not very significant
- 0 no impact
- 6 don't know

3. Which of the following impacts did you experience (check all that apply):

177 Greater awareness of current situations/threats among the community leaders/members

172 Opportunity for discussion among community members of current issues/threats/responses affecting hunting/ fishing/farming/gathering, subsistence or traditional foods

176 Opportunity for discussions about the relationship of traditional cultural practices/values/ to traditional food production and use in our community

108 Opportunity for community members to develop strategies programs or plans to respond to current threats

96 Opportunity for community members to assess current programs or activities by outside entities affecting traditional food resources and/or relevant cultural practices

159 Opportunity for community members to discuss way to respond to new or emerging threats or issues (including climate change and other environmental changes)

149 Opportunity to identify new changes/threats/improvements

3 There were no impacts

9 Other:

4. Overall, how helpful was this process in addressing related issues of concern to your community?

185 Very helpful

23 Helpful

4 Somewhat helpful

1 Not very helpful

0 Not helpful at all

5. Was the training and follow up assistance you received from project trainers sufficient to enable your/your communities informed participation?

182 Yes

10 No

12 Not sure

6. Overall how useful are the “*Cultural Indicators for Food Security, Food Sovereignty and Sustainable Development*” as an assessment tool/method for your community?

187 very important

23 important

3 somewhat important

- 1 not important
- 2 not sure

7. Do you think your community will continue to use them in the future?

- 104 Yes
- 97 We plan to
- 9 No
- 6 Don't know

8. Any additional comments or feedback? (Participants' comments were translated into English from original Spanish if needed by Rios Translations):

- 1) "Huge concerns around the issue of genetically modified seeds, terminator gene".
- 2) "The passing on of knowledge and values of traditions foods, beliefs, medicines, stories, and language etc is the most important to me."
- 3) "Very important information and learned lots today, interconnectedness of the detrimental environmental impact on today's society affecting the whole food chain"
- 4) "I spoke to my nephew last night regarding deer hunting. He stated that he has not seen any in the fields or even on the roads! We feel the loss for our brothers/sisters in nature."
- 5) "Continue your HR training and right to food workshops!! Spread the message."
- 6) "Awesome training and info. Love Andrea's presentations, especially."
- 7) "I learned what indicators are. Now I know why when you open up a deer and black spots are in it, which indicates something is very wrong in the environment."
- 8) "Yes, it was very important for our food"
- 9) "Very good presentations very informative, speakers were well versed"
- 10) "We need more participation at all levels"
- 11) "Great workshop, terminology was defined in layman's terms to better understanding".
- 12) "Very informational and inspiring session. Thank you."
- 13) "Bring this to Cold Lake First Nation. Maybe send PowerPoint or C.D. in the words that you've used in this presentation."
- 14) "Very informative need to have a follow up workshop more widely advertised and more grassroots people encouraged to attend."
- 15) "Great information and useful mechanism to the communities"
- 16) "It is necessary to carry to these workshops in more communities"
- 17) "More of our community members should have participated"
- 18) "I have been trying to incorporate this and was the missing link",
- 19) "Be thankful for all we have"
- 20) "This is an issue all Native people should know, climate change is important also"
- 21) "Thank you so much, I didn't know about the pesticides, it is very scary, you start to think if the air is clean, and also if our foods are taken away like the language where I am from, will I myself feel native anymore?"
- 22) "This was great-need more presentations like this"
- 23) "With good healthy foods we will be healthy"
- 24) "Knowledge about this is a base we can use to look for practical advances and

- improvements, and to begin discussions about our own practices that we can take to our communities”
- 25) “This training was like planting a seed which can grow into something strong and good for our community. This is a seed we can also take to other communities”
 - 26) “We think that by having a good organization, contact and unity, we can achieve our objectives.”
 - 27) “These cultural indicators should be part of our projects and there should be follow-up by IITC.”
 - 28) “This has been very important for the indigenous community in order to know how to apply a lot of things”.
 - 29) “This is very important because we are facing these kinds of situations”.
 - 30) “Very useful, because the people can see how the Cultural Indicators apply to their current problems”.
 - 31) “Yes. I think more time should be given to the practice we did, since it incorporates significant aspects of the presentation”.
 - 32) “To have direct contact with the people who were trained and have them talk about their own experience”.
 - 33) Have great success. Blessings from AJAU. Keep moving forward in this great process.”
 - 34) “That the presentation was very interesting because we were able to comprehend what Food Security is really about”.
 - 35) “Let’s continue. It’s like a struggle, until you find the result”.
 - 36) “We have to raise people’s awareness, so that we’ll all join together to recover our seeds: for fruit, corn, beans, and other seeds, etc.”
 - 37) “To hold workshops and activities that teach and educate people who don’t have an idea about what Indian people are going through. Workshops like these are important.”
 - 38) “The indicators should be a tool to improve our capacities in relation to food security.”
 - 39) “Cultural indicators for cultural and natural heritage”.
 - 40) “To invite all the linguistic communities: Xince, Garífuna, and Mayan youth.
 - 41) “The solutions are to remember how our ancestors knew when the rain was coming, about what seeds grew best in drought conditions, and how to collect and save the rain water because it is less now
 - 42) “The points the speaker gave were very interesting. Very informational to me.”
 - 43) “I’m just learning it is a lot but I’m hoping to be able to help the kids learn in our community and find ways to learn more.”
 - 44) “Need a follow-up meeting and more community participation”
 - 45) “Need more community council members involvement, tsin’ aen”
 - 46) “Great day! Great food! Great company! Lots of passion in the room to tap into.”
 - 47) “Participants from other areas of Alaska to give their own testimonies”
 - 48) “Thanks for getting us together”
 - 49) “More solutions-less threats”
 - 50) “I think we will need a follow-up meeting”
 - 51) “look forward to sharing this information with university students, thank you!”
 - 52) “Let us know when there is another event like this one so we can continue.

- Excellent workshop!”
- 53) “There shouldn’t be patenting of plants used for food or medicinal purposes.”
 - 54) “The possibility of more such meetings soon.”
 - 55) “Thank you for all the support. I hope answers result from this work. We want a lot more of this.”
 - 56) “Let’s all work together. “Titeguitigan to nochtin sehkan.” [Nahuatl for “Let’s all work together”]
 - 57) “Helped to build ties among indigenous peoples”.
 - 58) “Inter-American Court, defend the right to property (water)”
 - 59) “Stop violating the identity of the peoples”.
 - 60) “We need to request extraordinary measures from the Inter-American Court to protect our foods.”
 - 61) “Strong arguments needed addressing the economic, social and cultural consequences”
 - 62) “Valuable Cultural exchange”.
 - 63) “We need to act in our communities”
 - 64) “I learned about the cultures of other indigenous peoples and how they are protecting them”.
 - 65) “For me it was very important because I received information on how to measure the impacts on our culture and the environment”.
 - 66) “Very important. I’m going to share it with my community.”
 - 67) “This is Very important”.
 - 68) “It would be good to follow up, holding workshops in the region and also for you to send us information by e-mail”.
 - 69) “This meeting has been incredibly valuable”.
 - 70) “We need to be able to hold other workshops that you could direct to the communities”.
 - 71) “We, the indigenous peoples, want self-determination.”
 - 72) “This was good, because we have to get down to earth and see our two problems that we have as an indigenous people and not be playing politics. Thank you.”
 - 73) “Teach or train small groups of people from the communities or territories.”
 - 74) “Another workshop for the Mayangna Nation”.
 - 75) “We are subjects of rights. For that reason I liked your training a lot.”
 - 76) “Look for more training opportunities for community leaders.”
 - 77) “My comment is why is it that we, as indigenous peoples in this nation, have wealth but are living through a crisis (especially in this life).”
 - 78) “We have to invite more sectors and recommend that the ideas presented are objective.”
 - 79) “Traditional indigenous agricultural foods, hunting and fishing, are the foundation of the family.”
 - 80) “There should be a practice of ongoing preservation and reproduction of our knowledge”
 - 81) “I was impressed how closely tied the communities history is tied to impacts that have affected traditional foods also regarding coal mining, boarding schools, etc. Also positive programs like teaching about traditional foods in tribal school, restoring salmon run etc.”
 - 82) “We need to record what has happened in the past”

- 83) “Keep up the struggle for as long as it takes until we reach our objectives.”
- 84) “We have to keep struggling for the sovereignty of indigenous peoples.”
- 85) “Thank you” (6X)
- 86) “To let us know when there is another event like this one so we can continue.”
- 87) “This was an opportunity to develop relevant lesson plans integrating Western academics w/cultural values and traditions”
- 88) “This was an opportunity to learn about the situations in which indigenous peoples from the different regions live”
- 89) “Destruction of Forests is what needs more discussion”
- 90) “Important for our community leaders to know how to evaluate the current realities”
- 91) “Helped to share ideas among several communities and take a look at situations in common”.
- 92) “Gave me more understanding about the degradation of the environment”

Response Summary:

1. **96%** of respondents reported that **the issue of food sovereignty/food security was either very important or important** to their community or organization
2. **91%** of the respondents reported that participating in the process to apply the “*Cultural Indicators for Food Security, Food Sovereignty and Sustainable Development*” had either a **very significant or significant impact in their community**
3. Regarding the **specific impacts**, the 4 most frequent responses were:
 - a. **Greater awareness** of current situations and threats among community leaders/members **(82%)**
 - b. An **opportunity for discussion** among community members of current issues, threats and responses affecting hunting/ fishing/farming/gathering, subsistence activities or traditional foods **(80%)**
 - c. An opportunity for discussions about the **relationship of traditional cultural practices/values/ to traditional food production** and use in our community **(81%)**
 - d. An opportunity for community members to discuss **ways to respond** to new or emerging threats or issues (including climate change and other environmental changes) **(74%)**
4. **96%** of respondents stated that is process was either **very helpful or helpful in addressing related issues of concern to their community.**
5. **89%** of respondents reported that the **training and follow up assistance they received from the project trainers was sufficient** to enable your/your communities informed participation.
6. **97%** of respondents reported that, overall the “*Cultural Indicators for Food Security, Food Sovereignty and Sustainable Development*” were either **very useful or useful as an**

assessment tool/method for their communities.

7. Finally, **93%** of respondents thought that their community **will continued to use, or is currently planning to use** the Cultural Indicators in the future.

VII. Key Lessons Learned from the Field Testing of the Cultural Indicators

- 1) The main lesson IITC learned is that the Cultural Indicators, once they are presented and explained, and examples are provided to community members, do work as an effective tool and a methodology which communities can use to discuss measure, assess and evaluate changes and impacts. Both the identified themes and the innovative three-part format for each set of indicators (structural, process and results indicators) assist Indigenous communities not only to assess impacts but look at changes over time, explore root causes and develop responses on several levels. In addition:
- 2) The indicators were of equal interest and utility for communities in a range of ecosystems (desert, sub-arctic, mountain, coastal, forest and tropical) and covering a range of subsistence methods (farming, gathering, ranching/herding, hunting and fishing).
- 3) Presentations and training on the indicators can be tailored effectively for presentations to elders and well as youth and even young children (K-12), and the materials/concepts can be effectively translated into Native languages (indicating their basis in traditional cultural perspectives and understandings).
- 4) The Cultural Indicators are especially useful in stimulating collective internal discussions among and within communities about ways to strengthen the abundance, use, protection and transmission of traditional food-related resources, knowledge and practices to youth and future generations to insure its survival and resilience in the so called “modern” world. The two highest numbers of responses from participants regarding the ways the Cultural Indicators were most useful were: greater awareness among community members and leaders (177 out of 216 respondents) and opportunities for discussion among community members (176 out of 216 respondents about threats and solutions (see enclosed complied responses).
- 5) Across a number communities and geographic areas, the greatest interest areas and selected focus areas for discussion were the Indicator thematic areas addressing: a) denial of Free Prior Informed Consent (in particular regarding governmental, agency and, somewhat surprisingly, NGO programs which introduce new foods, food plants, animals and practices which communities feel undermine existing bio-cultural diversity and practices, for example GMO crops or invasive predator species of fish); b) loss of methods for transmitting related traditional knowledge to future generations as well as related ceremonial practices; c) impacts of environmental changes and contamination caused by mining, damming, deforestation, and increasingly, by global warming and climate change (i.e. hurricanes, melting ice, rapid winter warming and droughts); d) and lack of access and rights to land and water;
- 6) It was more cost effective to invite several neighboring communities and organizations to participate in one training, rather than attempting to hold separate training workshops in each

requesting community. In that way far more communities than the originally targeted. This format also provided opportunity for some very fruitful exchanges of information and ideas, as well as identification of similar concerns among different communities in the same region or country. In fact, networking and alliance-building among communities facing the same or similar kinds of threats, and opportunities for information sharing for effective solutions and responses, was another key project outcome;

- 7) This is a long-term process based on generating ongoing community discussions and strategic planning sessions. It was therefore most useful to focus on “training trainers” who agreed to take the information and training materials back to their communities and coordinate discussions and community assessments using the Indicators. A large number of participants requested and expressed the need for follow-up workshops.
- 8) Important and animated interchanges and discussions occurred both in the presentations and trainings which focused mainly on a single community/Nation/People as well as in those which combined number of communities, who were then able and eager to share and compare experiences;
- 9) Although the Indicator Theme Area addressing adaptation to changing conditions, which was somewhat controversial in itself at the 2006 Global Consultation (some indigenous participants originally did not want to include it, voicing the common view that they did not want to have to “adapt” their traditional food-related cultural practices), the increasing impacts of climate change have now made this indicator area a growing primary focus of interest and discussion. This Indicator theme seems to provide a very helpful tool to stimulate discussion and assessment in this critical area.
- 10) The educational materials, once developed, greatly assisted in produced much more focused results and discussions. Power point presentations and hand-outs were particularly helpful. These enhanced IITC’s ability to “train trainers” and provide them with educational tools to use in their own presentations; The evaluation questionnaires, in particular, were very helpful to both the participants and the presenters, and will continue to be used, although it is a challenge if/when many of the participants do not read or write in Spanish or English, or if this new process for them. This was addressed by doing group evaluations (i.e. in Rio Yaqui where most participants do not read and write well), collecting oral responses in an interview format, and/or asking community members to assist those who do not read or write (or speak English/Spanish) by completing the questionnaires with them orally and translating as needed. However, in some workshops, it may be appropriate or possible to disseminate and collect these, i.e. when time is very limited and/or when a workshop presentation is being shared with panelists/presenters from other organizations or covers a range of related themes.
- 11) The indicators are equally applicable and useful for Indigenous Peoples both in “developed” (i.e. US, Alaska and Canada) and “developing” regions i.e. Latin America). Threats, impacts and experiences of IPs in both have far more in common than they are different. For example, both in Guatemala and in the US, Indigenous Peoples are experiencing the affects of the introduction of non-traditional (including GMO and highly processed) foods, as well as alien plants, fish, animals and seeds via government and NGO distribution and “food security” programs. This is of great concern to Indigenous Peoples in many countries regarding the negative impacts on

both traditional practices and natural food related bio-diversity. Specific example mentioned by both Indigenous Peoples from Guatemala and the US is the introduction or predatory alien fish species promoted as helpful to “food security” that have wiped out native species.

- 12) Ongoing confirmation of the amazing depth of knowledge, expertise, clarity of thought and assessment brought to this process by the Indigenous experts, especially the elders and traditional food producers. Their capacity, creativity and willingness to work to bridge the gaps between traditional spiritual and cultural understandings and quantifiable objectives (“indicators”), which produced these indicators in the first place, greatly increased the quality and effectiveness of the results of these discussions as well.
- 13) The openness of FAO, the UNPFII and organizations such as the Social Investment Forum as well as International and academic institutions to listen to, recognize, take the Cultural Indicators into account and apply them as a useful assessment tools for their work as well is very much appreciated by the IITC and all participants.
- 14) Coordination and collaboration with host communities and organizations was very helpful in these efforts, as funding fell short of the projected goals, but we were able to make up for it by holding some of the training and presentation events in combination with other events which assisted with travel, organizing and on-site costs. Additional requests for workshops have been received from other communities, countries and regions (i.e. Africa, Caribbean and elsewhere in Latin and North America).
- 15) Through the discussions with the Cultural Indicators as a focal point, Indigenous communities were able to engage in discussions about issues that are often divisive or controversial, for example regarding development or religious practices, where there may be strong differences in views WITHIN communities, in a way that brought points of view together and provided a positive basis to build common understandings. The importance of traditional Foods and the need to protect them seem to be a unifying, “non controversial” theme in Indigenous communities and a good basis for positive discussion and collaborative work within and among Indigenous communities.
- 16) In the view of many participants, if governments (federal, state/provincial, and/or tribal) would use and apply the Cultural Indicators to measure their own work and programs impacting Indigenous Peoples’ food sovereignty, in conjunction with the Indigenous Peoples in question, they would have a better basis for evaluating their work. Participants in several countries called for the use of Cultural Indicators to measure impacts of governmental “Food security” programs to ensure that governmental programs for management of natural resources is compatible with Indigenous cultural values and protection of Indigenous rights. This includes in the adoption and implementation of tribal/Indigenous government ordinances, regulations and programs.
- 17) Indigenous Peoples were able to use the discussions on Cultural Indicators to familiarize themselves, using familiar community-based examples, with the rights contained in international instruments, including the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and Nation to Nation Treaties between States and Indigenous Peoples, and how

they can be upheld and implemented at the community level. In this regard, it was very helpful for Indigenous Peoples in the workshops to learn and share how a range of Indigenous communities are applying and asserting these rights in relation to the protection of their traditional foods and food-related resources.

- 18) Discussions of the Cultural Indicators of Food Sovereignty in the context of broader discussions of Indicators for Well-being of Indigenous Peoples makes it possible to advance understandings and evaluations of the relationships between related issues and areas including access to lands and territories, protection of biological diversity, and the rights to health and education among others.

VIII. Evaluation

Evaluation was ongoing and continued to be an important aspect of the project. After each training, trainers shared feedback and evaluations of their own as well as other trainers' presentations, and how they worked together. These were based on trainers' own observations as well as the oral and written responses from participants. They also assessed the educational materials and discussed how they could be improved based on their own impressions as well as an initial review of participants' evaluation responses when available.

IX. Conclusions and next steps

The field testing process for the Cultural Indicators in Indigenous communities demonstrated the importance of continuing to disseminate this unique and innovative tool. This process consistently provided a mechanism for indigenous Peoples to engage, assess, measure and develop practical responses to threats such as imposed development, loss of traditional knowledge and effects of climate change, among others. Our intention, and an apparent shared commitment given the overwhelmingly positive responses to this question in the questionnaires, is that the representatives of communities, organizations and agencies provided with training and capacity-building through these workshops will continue to disseminate and utilize this unique community assessment methodology developed by and for Indigenous Peoples.

X. Closing and Thanks

In closing the International Indian Treaty Council expresses our sincere appreciation to the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues for their continued interest and support of this initiative by and for Indigenous Peoples as an important component of their work on Indicators of Well-Being for Indigenous Peoples. We also, once again, express our appreciation for the partnership throughout this process of the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and its SARD Initiative, UN Development Program and other UN Agencies which took an interest, provided support for this initiative, and engaged in discussions relating to the Cultural Indicators in relationship to their own work and mandates.

We also warmly thank the Christensen Fund for their invaluable support and partnership for this project over the past 3 years, without which much of this work would not have been possible.

We also thank the Indigenous organizations who hosted and co-hosted the workshops and training sessions with IITC, including Centro de Proyectos de Desarrollo Integral Indígena (CEPRODI), La Unidad de La Fuerza Indígena Campesina (UFIC), El Centro para la Autonomía y Desarrollo de los Pueblos Indígena (CADPI), Centro de Culturas Indígenas de Perú (Chirapaq), Jittoa – Bat – Nataka- Weria, Beaver Lake Cree Nation, Chickaloon Village and White Earth Land Recovery Project, among others. Last but not least, we thank the hundreds of Indigenous community members who participated in this process for their important contributions, enthusiasm and the wisdom of their insights, as reflected in the very informative results contained in this report.

For all our Relations.

XI. Information Provided by the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO):

“CULTURAL INDICATORS OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES’ FOOD AND AGRO-ECOLOGICAL SYSTEMS: How FAO programs and policies can reinforce and promote Indigenous Peoples’ development with identity

Beginning in 2002, FAO worked with Indigenous Peoples’ organizations to identify a set of cultural indicators. 5 main cultural indicators categories were agreed upon following a series of surveys and global consultations¹. The objective of these indicators is to reflect the complexity of Indigenous peoples’ realities and priorities, and the fundamental relationship that exists between their livelihood strategies, culture and values. Unfortunately, these are aspects that are usually neglected by conventional definitions of poverty and the indicators that measure it. By extension, they also frequently take second place in development work.

The Cultural Indicators can help to measure impacts, relationships and interactions between culture and food and agro-ecological systems, as well as promote improved understanding, transparency and accountability between Indigenous Peoples and those working to assist and support them.

Based on work such as the cultural indicators done in collaboration with the IITC, FAO continues to work on the fundamental linkages between food security and cultural issues.

¹ 1) Access to, security for, and integrity of lands, territories, natural resources, sacred sites and ceremonial areas used for traditional food production;

2) Abundance, scarcity and/or threats regarding traditional seeds, plant foods and medicines, food animals, and the cultural practices associated with their protection and survival;

3) Use and transmission of methods, knowledge, language, ceremonies, dances, prayers, oral histories, stories and songs related to traditional foods and subsistence practices, and the continued use of traditional foods in daily diets;

4) Indigenous peoples’ capacity for adaptability, resilience and/or restoration regarding traditional food use and production in response to changing conditions;

5) Indigenous peoples’ ability to exercise and implement their rights to promote their food sovereignty.

Culture has been the mechanism through which agro-ecosystems and traditional foods have been maintained and adapted to changing conditions through the centuries. Without preserving culture, conserving these agricultural systems and traditional foods would be difficult. At the same time, the destruction of a food system or an agroecosystem can mean the end of a people. It is therefore fundamental to human well being and to cultural survival.

Two ongoing examples of FAO's work to sustain indigenous peoples' food security and cultural systems are: GIAHS and nutrition

Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS) Initiative

In 2002 FAO launched a partnership initiative on conservation and adaptive management of Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems.² The Initiative aims to reinforce the underlying ecological and socio-cultural processes that have sustained the agricultural practices of a given area, and to empower smallholder communities- many of which are indigenous- to dynamically conserve these traditional agricultural systems. Currently, the initiative has devised two projects for selected activities, the first involving Peru, Chile, China, Philippines, Tunisia and Algeria, and the second Kenya and Tanzania.

Indigenous Peoples' traditional food systems

Together with the Centre for Indigenous People's Nutrition and Environment (McGill University, Quebec), and with leaders of indigenous communities, FAO has documented 12 indigenous food systems around the world.³ The case studies focus on the fundamental relationships among people, traditional food practices and their supporting ecosystems. They demonstrate the inherent nutritional and emotional value of traditional foods as compared to modern food systems. Indeed, such foods not only underpin the food security and health conditions of the indigenous communities, but they are also valuable in spiritual and cultural terms, as well as to the principle of food sovereignty. Based on such findings, FAO and its partners have also begun to develop health strategies and interventions designed to improve community health and nutrition through the strengthening of traditional food systems.⁴

This work has demonstrated that culturally-sensitive approaches and sustainable management of natural resources can go hand in hand to create important development outcomes. For FAO in particular, experience has long shown that agricultural development cannot be sustainable without building upon the local knowledge, skills, practices, technologies, and organizations that people have developed over time to survive in different agro-ecological zones. Agriculture *depends* on culture, so the fight against hunger is also fundamentally dependent on intercultural dialogue and the continued survival of traditional practices of communities such as those that are present here at this Permanent Forum.

² Defined as "remarkable land-use systems and landscapes that are rich in globally significant biodiversity evolving from the co-adaptation of a community with its environment and its needs and aspirations for sustainable development."

³ The studies are from Canada, Japan, Peru, India, Nigeria, Colombia, Thailand, Kenya and the Federated States of Micronesia.

⁴ The book is available at www.fao.org/docrep/012/i0370e/i0370e00.htm.

Because different cultures have learned to solve agricultural problems in different ways, these experiences and knowledge systems can really contribute to finding innovative ways to tackle the world's challenges. Finally, this fight will also depend on creating alliances that foster these fundamental linkages, therefore we think partnerships like the one with IITC are very valuable and we look forward to discussing potential avenues for continued cooperation