

## **Veto Request on Bill no. 7735/2014**

From the Guardians of Agro-biodiversity

Keepers of Traditional Knowledges

Peoples of the Fields, Forests and Waters

To the President of the Federative Republic of Brazil

*Ref.: Veto Request on Bill no. 7735/2014, which regulates the access to and sharing of agro-biodiversity benefits, as well as the access to associated traditional knowledges for the purpose of scientific and economic exploitation.*

We, indigenous peoples, traditional peoples, and small landowners from Brazil, guardians, custodians and breeders of the national agro-biodiversity and keepers of traditional knowledge, represented by their entities and supported by the undersigned partner organizations, come before Your Excellency to expose our position and reasoning in order to request the total or partial veto on Bill no. 7735/2014, due to its contrariety to the public interest and its insurmountable vices of constitutionality.

In alignment with the reasons and goals stated in the Open Circular Letter from 27<sup>th</sup> February 2015, titled “*Indigenous peoples, local communities, and family farmers repudiate the bill that sells and destroys our national biodiversity*”, we reiterate our rejection of the illegal and antidemocratic way in which an issue of such importance to Brazilian society – an issue that will impact how future generations act toward the national agro-biodiversity –, has been conducted by the both Executive and the Legislative branches.

Once again, we restate our rejection of the approval of a legal framework for biodiversity in a parallel and conflicting way to the Nagoya Protocol about the access to genetic resources and the just and equal division of benefits, as ratified last year by over fifty countries at the Convention on Biological Diversity, and not signed by Brazil due to pressures from the

agribusiness sector. We assert this option will certainly lead to losses to the country with regards to international multilateral treaties.

We also repudiate the asymmetry in the extent of discussions carried out with interested private parties – especially regarding the economic exploitation of the national genetic heritage –, with which more than 300 meetings have been announced, to the detriment of the few spaces we, the guardians of agro-biodiversity and keepers of traditional knowledges, have conquered.

The result of our exclusion from the debates, and their hasty execution, exceeds mere political regression and loss of our historically acquired rights, and affects the whole of Brazilian society, for it represents the option to hand out all of the national agro-biodiversity, under the condition of – and only in some cases – paying 1% of profits, to companies that have largely been found guilty of biopiracy, with the sole justification of assuring “competitiveness in the bioprospecting”.

We have never denied dialogue and often proposed improvements to the project, as proven by our active participation both in the House of Representatives as in the Senate, where over a hundred proposals have been presented despite hindrances to a wider, democratic participation, as many more improvements could have been submitted.

The bill’s content represents a retrogression when instead of using the term *indigenous peoples* it uses *indigenous populations*, thwarting advancements in the recognition of these peoples’ rights. The coining of the term *traditional farmer* instead of *family farmer*, as defined by specific legislations and public policies, also represents a regression.

Among the amendments submitted, not a single one has been discussed at the House of Representatives, while at the Senate all of them were, 23 of which have been approved by the Senators and 11 turned down by Congressmen. Without the amendments ruled out at the House of Representatives, the bill is plagued by unconstitutionality and collides frontally with public interest and must therefore be wholly vetoed.

For the purpose of providing juridical support to the plea for total veto, we register that the deliberate exclusion of traditional knowledge holders

represents a direct violation of article 1, sole paragraph, and article 231 from the Federal Constitution of Brazil, as well as of articles 6, par. 1, and 15, par. 1, from ILO-Convention 169, and article 31 from UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

In case this is not Your Excellency's view of the matter, we present in the following lines our recommendations for partial vetoes that will purge the text from articles that represent constitutional vices and contrarities to the public interest.

### **Veto Recommendations:**

#### **a. Art. 9., § 1., III**

*Art. 9 Access to associated traditional knowledge of identifiable origin depends upon attainment of prior, informed consent.*

*§ 1 Proof of prior, informed consent can be acquired, at the discretion of the indigenous population (população indígena), the local community (comunidade tradicional) or the family farmer (agricultor familiar), by the following instruments, according to the rulings:*

*(...)*

*III – Assessment from official competent organ;*

This article establishes a series of instruments to prove prior informed consent to access associated traditional knowledge (associated, that is, to the components of the genetic heritage of interest).

Clause III, that allows the possibility of proving it through assessment from an official competent organ, cannot be kept. No public organ can speak in name of any indigenous people, traditional community or family farmer when conceding or denying prior consent to access to their traditional knowledge.

The project, that still awaits sanction, must include rights and instruments that safeguard peoples' and communities' ownership of their own knowledge, and that therefore, cannot be replaced by any organ or state agency.

The veto on this item, besides securing the right of traditional knowledge owners, would not constitute losses to the juridical security that the bill intends to create, as alternative instruments are already included.

**b. Art. 9, § 3**

*Art. 9(...)*

*§ 3 The access to traditional, heirloom or locally adapted genetic heritage for agricultural activities includes the access to the associated traditional knowledge of unknown origin that gave rise to the variety or species and does not depend upon prior consent from the indigenous people or traditional community or farmer that breed, develops, owns or keeps the variety or species.*

It is important to highlight that the initial project sent to the Executive did not include any provision regarding genetic heritage related to food and agriculture, and that these provisions were only added after the substitutive text presented by the Rapporteur at the House of Representatives, where the project was discussed.

Specifically, this provision creates a kind of non-right, as it establishes that any traditional knowledge related to genetic heritage of traditional, heirloom or locally adapted varieties for agricultural activities is attached to traditional knowledge, but also that said knowledge will always be of unidentifiable origin.

This paragraph deserves to be vetoed for its unconstitutionality in that it directly affronts articles 215, §1 and 216 of the Federal Constitution when it ignores that many indigenous peoples, *quilombola* communities and other peoples that practice agriculture develop progressively and over generations many methods of creating agricultural genetic heritage. It is

therefore often possible to identify the origin of traditional knowledge associated to agro-biodiversity.

**c. Art. 10, V**

*Art. 10 The indigenous peoples and traditional communities and farmers who create, develop, own or keep associated traditional knowledge are guaranteed the rights to:*

*(...)*

*V – freely use or sell products that contain genetic heritage or traditional knowledge, with due regard to the provisions present in Laws no. 9.456, from 25<sup>th</sup> April 1997, and 10.711, from 5<sup>th</sup> August 2003;*

This section addresses the right to freely use and sell products that contain genetic heritage or traditional knowledge, but creates a limitation to said right by subordinating it to the conditions of those laws, thereby putting the right of knowledge keepers in a collision route with, among others, the National Policy on Agroecology and Organic Production. (Decree 7.794/2012)

Besides, the concept of heirloom seed used in the bill is, under analysis, different from the one found on law 10.711/2003, creating a logical incompatibility between them.

Therefore, the veto intends to maintain the harmony in both the national juridical system and public interest, for the right to freely use and sell one's production is already guaranteed and is regulated not only by the two aforementioned laws, but by the whole of the national legal order.

**d. Art. 17, § 10.**

*Art. 17. The benefits from economic exploitation of the end product or reproductive material acquired from access to genetic heritage or traditional knowledge, even if produced out of the country, will be shared in a fair and equal way. In the case of an end product, most of the added value must stem from the component related to genetic heritage or traditional knowledge, according to what this law establishes.*

(...)

*§ 10. Economic exploitation of an end product or reproductive material performed after this law's coming into force, resulting from access to genetic heritage acquired before 29<sup>th</sup> June 2000, is exempt from the obligation of sharing the benefits, in the case the user can prove it, in the form of the rulings;*

This provision affronts the principle of isonomy, for it establishes a different rule for users performing the same activity. Even if both are exploiting a product resulting from access, the one who claim access was acquired before 29<sup>th</sup> June 2000 may not have to share the benefits.

We highlight the term “who claims access was acquired”, as Bill 7.735/2014 does not include any demands for proofs as to when such access was first made, leaving to the users the option of declaring it as they wish, which allows for the occurrence of breaches and frauds.

This affronts public interest, because it makes economic exploitation of products resulting from innovations post-29<sup>th</sup> June 2000 more costly.

If it is unfair for the user, it is even more so for providers, since they will not receive no contribution from a share of the benefits of such economic exploitation.

Besides, this device may be a hindrance to the approval of the Nagoya Protocol, for it confuses access with the effective economic exploitation of genetic heritage.

Also note that the aforementioned device violated the constitutional principle of non-retroactivity of the law, as it consider the date of the access, and not the date of economic exploitation as a parameter for the exemption of benefit sharing. Evidently it is a grave mistake, since the generator of the benefit to be shared is economic exploitation, and not access to genetic heritage or traditional knowledge.

Finally, it is important to highlight that this device was not in the text sent from the Presidency to the House of Representatives, and that its suppression was the object of an amendment voted in the Federal Senate.

**e. Art. 19, § 4.**

*Art. 19. The sharing of benefits arising from the economic exploitation of the end product or reproductive material acquired due to access to genetic heritage or traditional knowledge may be of following types:*

*I – monetary; or*

*II – non-monetary, including, among others:*

*(...)*

*§ 4 In case of a sharing of the non-monetary sort, the user may indicate the beneficiary of such a sharing.*

Paragraph 4 is a stark deviation from the whole legal framework designed here, as it states it will be up to the users, and them exclusively, to determine who the recipient of the division of benefits will be. Indigenous peoples, local communities and family farmers are the main responsible for *in situ* conservation of biodiversity, a merit also recognized by international conventions and treatises. There is no reason to leave the definition of the benefit division's destination exclusively up to the users, with no participation of owners, and that also violates the devices of the Nagoya Protocol, especially regarding mutually agreed terms.

The device does not even establishes any criteria for the choice, allowing the users to choose however they like. Since there is no criteria nor control mechanisms, the users may even choose to benefit himself.

In addition, it is known that users often tend to benefit only the communities that supply raw material. Besides harming a beneficiary turnover, this scenario may even transform the division of benefits into a bargaining instrument for price reduction, leaving communities in an even more commercially unbalanced situation.

For the division of benefits of the monetary sort, the law establishes a system for the evaluation of the resources' destinations, including a benefit

division policy. To allow the users to indicate the beneficiary in the non-monetary modality, without any control or criteria, is to break with the whole logic of the system created by this new legal framework.

Besides, the genetic heritage is not ownership of the users, therefore, it is not up to them to decide by themselves alone the destination of the sharing of benefits.

Finally, we highlight that this device was also not a part of the original text sent from the Executive to the House of Representatives and that the text approved in the Senate modified its redaction, including criteria for the destination of the sharing of non-monetary benefits.

Therefore, the veto to this device is recommended, leaving for the infra-legal regulations the task of detailing the destination of the sharing of non-monetary benefits.

**f. Art. 21**

*Art. 21. With the purpose of guaranteeing the competitiveness of the concerning economic sector, the Federal Government may, according to regulations, conclude sectoral agreements that permit reductions in the value of the monetary sharing of benefits up to 0.1% of the net annual revenue obtained from the economic exploitation of the end product or the reproductive material stemming from access to genetic heritage or associated traditional knowledge of unidentified origin.*

*Sole paragraph: In order to subsidize the conclusion of a sectoral agreement, official agencies acting in the defense of the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities may be heard, according to regulations.*

The possibility to reduce the quota of the share of benefits down to 0.1% of the net annual revenue is a serious violation of the Convention on Biological Diversity, since an excessive burden is imposed upon one of the



parties, clearly offending the principles of fairness and equity that should guide this regulation.

It cannot be allowed that, in order to secure “competitiveness”, the rights of those that defend the national agro-biodiversity as well as their traditional knowledge be violated.

As to the sole paragraph, the stipulation that hearing the official agencies that act in behalf of indigenous peoples and local communities is not mandatory, but a mere possibility, represents a stark retrocession in respect to the regulation present in the Executive Order (*medida provisória*) no. 2186-16, and must therefore be vetoed, bearing in mind the prohibition of social retrocession.

**g. Art. 29, § 3.**

*Art. 29. The agencies tasked with the controlling of infractions against the genetic heritage and against associated traditional knowledge, in keeping with their competences, are: IBAMA (Brazilian Institute of Environment and Renewable Natural Resources), the Command of the Navy, and the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Supplies, in agreement with paragraphs 1, 2 and 3.*

(...)

*§ 3 Infractions concerning access to genetic heritage or associated traditional knowledge in agricultural practices are subjected to control by the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Supplies.*

To grant the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Supplies the competence to control the access to traditional farming-associated knowledge violates public interest as it creates the possibility of conflicts of jurisdiction between this Ministry and the Ministry of the Environment, among others, especially regarding the control over questions that deal with indigenous peoples and local communities with agricultural practices.

Most importantly, this legal provision does away with the prerogative that IBAMA – Brazilian Institute of Environment and Renewable Natural Resources – is to exert police power over environmental matters, violating thereby article 225, § 1, II, of the Federal Constitution, as well as the National Environmental Policy and Law no. 7.735/1989, all of which establish the referred federal autarchy as the executive agency responsible for the environmental policies in Brazil.

The Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Supplies is known to family farmers, traditional peoples and local communities precisely for not being open to dialogue with the holders of traditional knowledges. That it assumes the role of monitoring authority represents an attack on the historically maintained dialogue with other Ministries.

**h. Art. 41, § 4.**

*Art. 41. The signing of a Term of Commitment will suspend, in all cases:*

*(...)*

*§ 4 The users that have begun the process of regularization before the coming into force of this law may, at their discretion, share the benefits according to Executive Order no. 2186-16, from 23th August 2001.*

This is yet another provision that violates the principles of fairness and equity in the sharing of benefits, as it grants the user the option to choose the regime of sharing and creates unnecessary hurdles to the ratification of the Nagoya Protocol, specifically in what it refers to mutual agreed terms.

In practice, this provision creates a situation in which no isonomy is possible, putting the interest of the providers and the users against each other. By giving the latter the possibility to choose the regime which best fits them, the providers inevitably end up with a burdensome one.

It cannot be allowed that an already revoked norm be applied; all the more so when it concerns a benefit designed only for the sake of the user while completely disregarding the holder of traditional knowledge, thereby ignoring the constitutional principle of equality.

Furthermore, the Executive Order does not address at any moment traditional knowledges of unidentified origin, so that its regulation must always follow according to the new law.

**i. Art. 44**

*Art. 44. Civil indemnities, of which the Federal Government is creditor, related to genetic heritage or associated traditional knowledge are remitted.*

Hypotheses in which the Federal Government is creditor of civil indemnities related to associated traditional knowledge are unknown, so that this article may give rise to interpretations that lead to the remission of debts not originally intended by this rule.

Besides, as the genetic heritage is a protected legal interest of the whole collectivity – so that the Federal Government acts only as its substitute guardian, as enunciated in article 225 of the Federal Constitution –, the State would not be allowed to give up the due civil reparations arising from damages against biodiversity.

As such, this unconstitutionality demands the veto on the concerned provision.

**Conclusions**

These are the reasons that justify a total or partial veto on Bill no. 7735/2014. We would like to stress, Madam President of the Republic, that we are willing to openly discuss the aforementioned veto pleas, in order to try and mitigate the exclusion of the protectors and providers of traditional knowledge present in the original text of the Bill.

The present request is undersigned by:

1. ARTICULAÇÃO DOS POVOS E ORGANIZAÇÕES INDÍGENAS DO NE, MG E ES - APOINME
2. ARTICULAÇÃO DOS POVOS INDÍGENAS DO BRASIL - APIB
3. ARTICULAÇÃO DOS POVOS INDÍGENAS DO SUL - ARPINSUL
4. ARTICULAÇÃO ESTADUAL DAS COMUNIDADES TRADICIONAIS DE FUNDO E FECHO DE PASTO DA BAHIA
5. ARTICULAÇÃO NACIONAL DE AGROECOLOGIA – ANA
6. ARTICULAÇÃO PACARI PLANTAS MEDICINAIS DO CERRADO
7. ARTICULAÇÃO PUXIRÃO DOS POVOS FAXINALENSES
8. ARTICULAÇÃO ROSALINO DE POVOS E COMUNIDADES TRADICIONAIS DO NORTE DE MINAS
9. AS-PTA AGRICULTURA FAMILIAR E AGROECOLOGIA
10. ASSOCIAÇÃO BRASILEIRA DE AGROECOLOGIA - ABA
11. ASSOCIAÇÃO CAMPONESA JOSUÉ DE CASTRO
12. ASSOCIAÇÃO CEDRO – CENTRO DE ESTUDO E DISCUSSÃO ROMANI
13. ASSOCIAÇÃO DAS MULHERES DO CAMPO NOVA GALILEIA – AMRUNG/COLÍDER-MT
14. ASSOCIAÇÃO DE APICULTORES DE CAETITE
15. ASSOCIAÇÃO DE APOIO À VERTICALIZAÇÃO DA PRODUÇÃO FAMILIAR – APROVE
16. ASSOCIAÇÃO DE COMUNIDADES DA DIÁSPORA AFRICANA POR DIREITO À ALIMENTAÇÃO - REDE KODYA
17. ASSOCIAÇÃO DE MULHERES CAMPONESAS DO MUNICIPIO DE CAETITE

18. ASSOCIAÇÃO DE MULHERES CATADORAS DE MANGABAS
19. ASSOCIAÇÃO DE MULHERES VITÓRIA-RÉGIA - CULTURA, MEIO AMBIENTE, DIREITOS HUMANOS, TURISMO E VOLUNTARIADO
20. ASSOCIAÇÃO DE PRODUTORES AGROECOLÓGICOS DE VERÊ - APAV
21. ASSOCIAÇÃO DE PRODUTORES ORGÂNICOS DE SÃO JORGE D'OESTE – AORSA
22. ASSOCIAÇÃO DE VITIVINICULTORES DE VERÊ - APROVIVE
23. ASSOCIAÇÃO DOS AGRICULTORES FAMILIARES DO VALE DO RIO DO MEIO – AAFVARIME/COLÍDER-MT
24. ASSOCIAÇÃO DOS AGRICULTORES GUARDIÕES DA AGROBIODIVERSIDADE DE TENENTE PORTELA - AGABIO
25. ASSOCIAÇÃO DOS PEQUENOS AGRICULTORES DA BAHIA – APASBA
26. ASSOCIAÇÃO DOS PEQUENOS AGRICULTORES DO ESTADO DA BAHIA - APAESBA
27. ASSOCIAÇÃO DOS PEQUENOS PRODUTORES HORTIFRUTIGRANJEIROS DE COLÍDER – APPHFCOL/COLÍDER-MT
28. ASSOCIAÇÃO DOS PRODUTORES JOVENS KARIRI XOCÓ
29. ASSOCIAÇÃO DOS RETIREIROS DO ARAGUAIA - ARA
30. ASSOCIAÇÃO GAÚCHA DE PROTEÇÃO AO AMBIENTE NATURAL - AGAPAN
31. ASSOCIAÇÃO MAE DA RESEX MAPUA
32. ASSOCIAÇÃO MAE DA RESEX TERRA GRANDE – PRACUUBA

33. ASSOCIAÇÃO NACIONAL CIGANAS CALINS
34. ASSOCIAÇÃO NACIONAL CULTURAL DE PRESERVAÇÃO DE PATRIMÔNIO BANTU – ACBANTU
35. ASSOCIAÇÃO PARA O DESENVOLVIMENTO DA AGROECOLOGIA - AOPA
36. ASSOCIAÇÃO POMERANA DE PANCAS
37. ASSOCIAÇÃO POMERSUL
38. ASSOCIAÇÃO THYDEWA
39. CENTRAL DE MOVIMENTOS POPULARES DO BRASIL- CMP-BR
40. CENTRO DE AGRICULTURA ALTERNATIVA DO NORTE DE MINAS GERAIS – CAA/NM
41. CENTRO DE APOIO AO PEQUENO AGRICULTOR - CAPA - VERÊ
42. CENTRO DE TECNOLOGIAS ALTERNATIVAS DA ZONA DA MATA - CTA-ZM
43. CENTRO DOS TRABALHADORES DA AMAZÔNIA-CTA
44. COMITÊ CHICO MENDES - CCN
45. COMITÊ INTERINSTITUCIONAL MUNICIPAL DE EDUCAÇÃO DO CAMPO DE COLÍDER-MT
46. COMITÊ POPULAR DO RIO PARAGUAI
47. COMUNIDADES EXTRATIVISTAS APANHADORAS DE FLORES SEMPRE-VIVAS (CODECEX)
48. CONSELHO INDIGENISTA MISSIONÁRIO – CIMI
49. CONSELHO NACIONAL DAS POPULAÇÕES EXTRATIVISTAS – CNS
50. COOPERATIVA DE PEQUENOS PRODUTORES AGRÍCOLAS DOS BANCOS COMUNITÁRIOS DE SEMENTES – COPPABACS

51. COOPERATIVA MISTA DE PRODUÇÃO E COMERCIALIZAÇÃO DO ESTADO DA BAHIA - CPC
52. COORDENAÇÃO DAS COMUNIDADES TRADICIONAIS CAIÇARAS - CNCC
53. COORDENAÇÃO NACIONAL DE ARTICULAÇÃO DAS COMUNIDADES NEGRAS RURAIS QUILOMBOLAS – CONAQ
54. ECO MUSEU TEKOÁ KA’AGUY MIRIM-FLORESTA PEQUENA ARAKUÃ
55. FEDERAÇÃO DAS COMUNIDADES QUILOMBOLAS DE MINAS GERAIS (N,GOLO)
56. FEDERAÇÃO NACIONAL DOS TRABALHADORES ARTESÃOS DO BRASIL
57. FÓRUM DE ECONOMIA SOLIDÁRIA DE CÁCERES
58. GRUPO RAÍZES
59. ILE AXE ALAGBEDE
60. MOVIMENTO DA CULTURA ALIMENTAR TRADICIONAL DO BRASIL
61. MOVIMENTO DA CULTURA ALIMENTAR TRADICIONAL DO RIO GRANDE DO SUL
62. MOVIMENTO DAS APRENDIZES DA SABEDORIA (BENZEDORES E BENZEDEIRAS, PARTEIRAS, E COSTUREIRAS DE RENDIDURA) - MASA
63. MOVIMENTO DAS MULHERES CAMPONESAS – MMC
64. MOVIMENTO DE MORADIA DA CIDADE DE SÃO PAULO – MMC
65. MOVIMENTO DOS ATINGIDOS POR BARRAGENS - MAB
66. MOVIMENTO DOS PEQUENOS AGRICULTORES – MPA

67. MOVIMENTO DOS PESCADORES E PESCADORAS  
ARTESANAIS DO PARANÁ – MOPEAR
68. MOVIMENTO DOS TRABALHADORES RURAIS SEM TERRA  
– MST
69. MOVIMENTO GERAIZERO
70. MOVIMENTO INTERESTADUAL DAS QUEBRADEIRAS DE  
COCO BABAÇU – MIQCB
71. MOVIMENTO MUNDIAL PELAS FLORESTAS TROPICAIS  
(WORLD RAINFOREST MOVEMENT - WRM)
72. MOVIMENTO NACIONAL DOS PESCADORES - MONAPE
73. MULHERES EM AÇÃO NO PANTANAL - MUPAN
74. ORGANIZAÇÃO DAS ASSOCIAÇÕES DA RESERVA  
EXTRATIVISTA TAPAJÓS ARAPIUNS – TAPAJOARA
75. RAIZES DA TRADIÇÃO
76. REDE CAIÇARA DE CULTURA UNIÃO DOS MORADORES  
DA JUREIA
77. REDE CERRADO
78. REDE DAS CULTURAS POPULARES E TRADICIONAIS DO  
BRASIL
79. REDE DAS CULTURAS POPULARES E TRADICIONAIS DO  
RIO GRANDE DO SUL
80. REDE DE AGROBIODIVERSIDADE DO SEMIÁRIDO  
MINEIRO
81. REDE DE COMUNIDADES TRADICIONAIS PANTANEIRA
82. REDE DE CULTURA CAIÇARA
83. REDE ECOVIDA DE AGROECOLOGIA
84. REDE PUXIRÃO DE POVOS E COMUNIDADES  
TRADICIONAIS



85. SOCIEDADE CIVIL DA COMISSÃO NACIONAL DE POVOS E COMUNIDADES TRADICIONAIS - CNPCT
86. SOCIEDADE FÉ E VIDA
87. TERREIRO YLE AXE OMÃ OXUM LÁMAN
88. UNIÃO DOS MORADORES DA JUREIA
89. VIA CAMPESINA
90. VIA CAMPESINA SUDAMÉRICA

The present request is supported by:

91. ASSOCIAÇÃO ARTICULADORA DOS FAXINALENSES DA METROPOLITANA - ASAFAXIM
92. ASSOCIAÇÃO BRASILEIRA DE ANTROPOLOGIA - ABA
93. ASSOCIAÇÃO BRASILEIRA DE ESTUDANTES DE ENGENHARIA FLORESTAL - ABEEF
94. ASSOCIAÇÃO BRASILEIRA DE ETNOMUSICOLOGIA
95. ASSOCIAÇÃO DE ADVOGADOS DE TRABALHADORES RURAIS DA BAHIA - AATR
96. ASSOCIAÇÃO DE ESTUDOS, ORIENTAÇÃO E ASSISTÊNCIA RURAL –ASSESOAR
97. ASSOCIACAO DE PROFESSORES DE DIREITO AMBIENTAL DO BRASIL - APRODAB
98. CAMPANHA PERMANENTE CONTRA OS AGROTÓXICOS E PELA VIDA
99. CÁRITAS REGIONAL MINAS GERAIS
100. CENTRO DE APOIO A PROJETOS DE AÇÃO COMUNITÁRIA – CEAPAC
101. CENTRO DE DEFESA DOS DIREITOS HUMANOS E EDUCAÇÃO POPULAR DO ACRE – CDDHEP

102. CENTRO ECOLÓGICO
103. COLEGIADO SETORIAL NACIONAL DE ARTESANATO  
DO CONSELHO NACIONAL DE POLÍTICA CULTURAL/MINC
104. COLETIVO DIREITOS PARA TODXS
105. COMISSÃO NACIONAL DAS RESEX COSTEIRAS E  
MARINHAS DO BRASIL – CONFREM
106. COMISSÃO PRÓ-ÍNDIO DE SÃO PAULO
107. COOPERATIVA CENTRAL DO CERRADO
108. COORDENADORIA ECUMÊNICA DE SERVIÇO - CESE
109. ESCRITÓRIO DE DIREITOS HUMANOS DA PRELAZIA  
DE SÃO FÉLIX DO ARAGUAIA – MT
110. FASE – SOLIDARIEDADE E EDUCAÇÃO
111. FASE SOLIDARIEDADE E EDUCAÇÃO - MT
112. FEDERAÇÃO DOS ESTUDANTES DE AGRONOMIA DO  
BRASIL
113. FÓRUM BRASILEIRO DE ONGS E MOVIMENTOS  
SOCIAIS PARA O MEIO AMBIENTE E O  
DESENVOLVIMENTO - FBOMS
114. FÓRUM DOS ATINGIDOS PELA INDÚSTRIA DO  
PETRÓLEO E PETROQUÍMICA NAS CERCANIAS DA BAÍA  
DE GUANABARA - FAPP-BG
115. FÓRUM NACIONAL DE COMBATE AOS IMPACTOS  
DOS AGROTÓXICOS
116. FRENTE DE ESQUERDA DA UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL  
DO PARANÁ - UFPR
117. FUNDAÇÃO GRUPO ESQUEL BRASIL - FGEB
118. GRUPO CARTA DE BELÉM
119. GRUPO DE TRABALHO AMAZÔNICO-GTA
120. GRUPO SEMENTE – MT

121. GT-BIODIVERSIDADE DA ANA
122. INSTITUTO AUGUSTO CARNEIRO
123. INSTITUTO DE ENSINOS DIREITO E CIDADANIA - IEDC
124. INSTITUTO DE PESQUISA E EDUCAÇÃO AMBIENTAL –GAIA-MT
125. INSTITUTO DE PESQUISA E FORMAÇÃO INDÍGENA - IEPÊ
126. INSTITUTO FLORESTA – MT
127. INSTITUTO GAÚCHO DE ESTUDOS AMBIENTAIS/RS - INGÁ
128. INSTITUTO HUMANA RAÇA FÊMININA – INHURAFE
129. INSTITUTO INTERNACIONAL DE EDUCAÇÃO DO BRASIL - IEB
130. INSTITUTO INTERNACIONAL DE EDUCAÇÃO DO BRASIL (IEB)
131. INSTITUTO O DIREITO POR UM PLANETA VERDE
132. INSTITUTO SOCIEDADE POPULAÇÃO E NATUREZA - ISPN
133. INSTITUTO SOCIOAMBIENTAL – ISA
134. KOINONIA PRESENÇA ECUMÊNICA E SERVIÇO
135. MARCHA MUNDIAL DAS MULHERES
136. MOVIMENTO CIÊNCIA CIDADÃ – MAGDA ZANONI
137. MOVIMENTO DE ASSESSORIA JURÍDICA UNIVERSITÁRIA POPULAR - MAJUP ISABEL DA SILVA
138. MUSEU DA AMAZÔNIA
139. NÚCLEO DE CULTURA E EXTENSÃO (NACE-PTECA) – ESALQ/USP
140. NÚCLEO DE ECOJORNALISTAS DO RS (NEJ-RS)

141. NÚCLEO DE ESTUDOS EM SAÚDE COLETIVA (NESC)/UFPR
142. OBSERVATÓRIO DOS CONFLITOS DO EXTREMO SUL DO BRASIL
143. OCA-LABORATÓRIO DE EDUCAÇÃO E POLÍTICA AMBIENTAL/ESALQ/USP
144. PACTO DAS ÁGUAS - MT
145. PASTORAL ANGLICANA DA TERRA
146. PLATAFORMA DHECA DE DIREITOS HUMANOS, ECONÔMICOS, SOCIAIS, CULTURAIS E AMBIENTAIS
147. PONTO DE CULTURA VITÓRIA-RÉGIA
148. REDE BRASILEIRA DE JUSTIÇA AMBIENTAL
149. REDE DE COOPERAÇÃO AMAZÔNICA – RCA
150. REPRESENTAÇÃO DA REGIÃO SUL NO COLEGIADO SETORIAL NACIONAL DE ARTESANATO DO CNPC/MINC
151. SOCIEDADE BRASILEIRA DE CIÊNCIA E TECNOLOGIA DE ALIMENTOS
152. SOCIEDADE BRASILEIRA DE ETNOBIOLOGIA E ETNOECOLOGIA – SBEE
153. SOCIEDADE DE ESTUDOS INTERDISCIPLINARES DE COMUNICAÇÃO (INTERCOM)
154. TERRA DE DIREITOS
155. WWF-BRASIL