

**”AMAZONAS DIALOG FORUM”: LAND GOVERNANCE AND TRADITIONAL
POPULATIONS RIGHTS IN BRAZILIAN AMAZON**

**ANDRÉ SEGURA TOMASI
JOSINALDO ALEIXO
AILTON DIAS**

Instituto Internacional de Educação do Brasil, Brazil

andre@iieb.org.br

josi@iieb.org.br

ailton@iieb.org.br

**Paper prepared for presentation at the
“2018 WORLD BANK CONFERENCE ON LAND AND POVERTY”
The World Bank - Washington DC, March 19-23, 2018**

Copyright 2018 by author(s). All rights reserved. Readers may make verbatim copies of this document for non-commercial purposes by any means, provided that this copyright notice appears on all such copies.

Abstract:

The Brazilian Amazon still lack a defined property arrangement and land regularization, which can guarantee traditional populations rights' effectiveness and fulfillment. Insecurity in land tenure within Protected Areas affects communities development, constraining opportunities for income generation, access to public policies and deforestation. In response to this, the "Amazonas Dialog Forum" was created in 2012 as a result of efforts channelized by three civil society organizations: Brazil's International Education Institute (IEB), Land Pastoral Commission (CPT) and National Council for Extractive Populations (CNS). The objective is to promote land regularization in Protected Areas categorized as "Sustainable Use", and to ensure traditional people's social, economic and environmental rights, promoting their protagonism in the territorial planning agenda. Its approach is based on putting together national and state land agencies responsible for land regularization in Amazonas state, Brazil. Up to now, the "Forum" provided land documentation for around 1,468 families, regularizing approximately 2,3 million hectares.

Key Words: Brazilian Amazon, Governance, Territorial Rights, Traditional Populations

1 CONTEXT ANALYSIS: THE AMAZON LAND TENURE QUESTION

Until the middle of 20th century non-indigenous occupation of the Amazon was carried out mainly through economic cycles linked to foreign demands. The first major regional migratory wave occurred in the late 19th century as a result of international demand for rubber tree latex (*Hevea brasiliensis*), especially for the industrialized countries of the Northern hemisphere. At this time, the recurrence of severe droughts in Brazil's Northeast region made this area the source for labor force. Thus, Northeasterners ("Nordestinos") became essential for rubber tapping in the Amazon forest. A whole sophisticated commercial chain based on rubber extraction was structured throughout the region, covering the large tract of the Amazon in Brazil and neighboring countries such as Peru and Bolivia.

This productive system had its operative base linked to the "rubber company", often financed by the "aviator houses" associated to State concessions of large land portions in Amazonian confines, which sought, in turn, to meet the international capital needs. However, the "spearhead" of the entire system was the families of poor peasants who set out in the backlands of the Amazon to establish settlements with all sorts of sacrifices and human degradations. In this way, they contributed to establish a traditional way of forest occupation and resources exploitation, establishing a very peculiar pattern of settlement in the region.

A key issue in the cycles of occupation and agroextractivist exploitation in the Amazon is the fact that the economic agents interest was not in land appropriation and occupation itself, but in forest resources utilization, especially the rubber trees. Thus, the penetration and occupation fronts were oriented by the location of the forest species and the formal and regulated ownership of land was not crucial for system perpetuation and reproduction. This occupation dynamics, throughout the early 20th century, was responsible for the expansion of national borders and the formation of a traditional regime of occupation in which the documentation of properties or possessions was a secondary factor, especially for the immigrant extractive contingent.

From the 1960s, amidst the crisis of rubber extraction, a new migratory wave with a radically different sense of precedents would dramatically change the way the Amazon was occupied. Through government incentives outlined and put into practice mainly during the military regime (1964-1985), new population contingents were attracted to the region. Colonial projects and openings of major roads, such as the BR-230 - the Transamazonica - attracted settlers from the south-central and other regions of the country with the objective of occupying and producing in the Amazon, with the promise of titling the lands and implementation of infrastructure to support production and livelihoods.

However, only a small part of the new occupations or possessions were duly regularized and the region became the scene of an intense process of illegal appropriation of public lands (grilagem). In this new dynamic, land tenure is the central factor of the economic system, being an asset valued both as a basis for new economic activities and for speculative purposes. More recently, the conversion of the forest into pastures to enable extensive cattle raising, expansion of grain crops, logging, mining (mining) and large infrastructure works have been the vectors of occupation of the region.

From the confrontation between the new forms of occupation of the Amazon centered on the possession of the land (for agricultural production or speculation) and the traditional regime of occupation based on the use of the forest (extractivism) an infinity of territorial and land conflicts arose, some of which with consequences especially for the weakest link in the chain: indigenous peoples and traditional communities in the region.

Amidst the social and political tensions created, the state and federal governments were unable to arbitrate or mitigate conflicts, but also contributed to their aggravation by encouraging the new fronts of occupation. The unfolding of the conflicts that emerged from the 1970s onwards was the emergence of new political subjects that began to demand the recognition and guarantee of territorial rights in favor of the families and communities agroextractivists frankly threatened by the new fronts of occupation of the Amazon.

Thus, in the 1980s, with the epicenter of the state of Acre, the rubber tappers' movement began to charge and guide the territorial and land policies of the federal government to the point of establishing the concept of Extractive Reserve (RESEX): a protected area recognized by the government that would guarantee access to land and resources in favor of the extractive populations that used it. It was the so-called "agrarian reform" of the forest. In 2000, the concept of RESEX joined other categories of Conservation Units (UCs), such as National Forests, to form the National System of Conservation Units (SNUC) established by Federal Law 9.985 / 2000.

Although conservation units, such as RESEXs and FLONAs, have represented a tremendous advance in the recognition and defense of the territorial rights of traditional peoples and communities, the enactment of these units does not automatically and completely solve the land problem that afflicts many communities. Territorial interests and units, such as official titles valid or not, documentary evidence of various sources, municipal, state and federal collections at different stages of collection, registration and formal destination may be included on a territory delimited as UC. With the enactment of the UCs also arise their different

"owners" who claim dominion over specific portions of the territory and the right to indemnities. These demands almost always result in litigation and judicialization, a process that can last for decades without a definitive solution.

The non-regularization of land tenure of a CU is today the greatest obstacle to its implementation in fact and in law. It is such a complex and slow process that often seems impossible because of the low level of governance and diversity of public and private actors who present themselves as stakeholders in the various portions of land that make up a CU. While land regularization does not take place, traditional families and communities are left out of their most basic rights and access to public policies because they do not have an official document that assures their effective right over a collective territory already demarcated and destined.

Land tenure insecurity limits the possibilities for development of traditional resident communities, affects income generation, economic activities and access to public policies. Consequently, it causes rural exodus and increased deforestation. Reversing this framework of state insufficiency and promoting land-use planning through land regularization of sustainable use PAs (RSEXs and FLONAs) are structural objectives of the "Amazon Dialogue Forum".

2 LAND CHAOS: IMPLICATIONS ON SUSTAINABLE USE PROTECTED AREAS IN THE STATE OF AMAZONAS

The creation of Conservation Units for sustainable use - Extractive Reserves and National Forests -, especially in the early 2000s, was and still has been an important milestone in the struggle to guarantee rights to the riverine and extractive populations of the Amazon. But unfortunately, the creation of these territorial units has not been accompanied by effective measures of land regularization, documentation and formalization of the traditional occupations of the communities that hold this type of territorial law.

In illustrating the situation, a study published in 2014 by ICMBio shows that of the total of 312 federal Conservation Units in the country, which occupy an area of 75.1 million hectares (10% of the national territory), 16.9 million hectares irregularly occupied by private properties.

Also, according to information systematized by the Federal Public Prosecutor's Office (MPF), even with the availability of resources for the regularization of federal PAs, public management does not happen as expected: of the total resources available for land regularization of PAs between 2008 and 2010, only 38%

was executed. Of a goal of 5,000,000 ha regularization by the ICMBio, in 2010, only 1,777 ha had been effectively regularized, which corresponds to 0.04% of the proposed goal (MPF / AM, 2013).

Between 2012 and 2013, the Brazilian Court of Audit carried out an audit of the governance of Conservation Units, looking at the relationship between the financial resources applied and the strategic results achieved. The audit report makes a strong analysis of the low effectiveness of the management of PAs and mentions the land impasse, since "the identified land regularization liability has a direct impact on the management of PAs, given the lack of definition of ownership and ownership of these PAs. lands".

The State of Amazonas currently has 111 CUs, 47 of which are federal, 41 are state and 23 are municipal, totaling around 35% of its territory with this modality of protected area (more than 44 million hectares). Of these PAs, 58 are of sustainable use (RESEXs and FLONAs). The State Department of Conservation Units (DEMUC) is managed by the State Department of Protected Areas, while the Federations are managed by the Chico Mendes Institute for Biodiversity Conservation (ICMBio).

In the case of Amazonas PAs, unregulated parcels of these PAs belong to different "owners": the state government, the Secretariat of Patrimony of the Union (SPU), the National Institute of Colonization and Agrarian Reform (INCRA), Terra Legal Program, municipal governments and owners private partnerships, which is a framework of enormous complexity of land and state insufficiency to deal with this intricate configuration of governance. To illustrate this situation, RESEX Medium Purus, located in the municipalities of Lábrea and Pauini, has more than 600 thousand hectares of extension, and in its perimeter there are all sorts of land arrangements: uncollected land, private property, land of SPU's domain and lands of the state government.

The fact that a UC is not regularized and ordered, makes it difficult to consolidate. The supposed landowners do not respect the management plans of the Units, they open a breach for illegal productive chains and arrangements, land insecurity generates conflict and violence, deforestation finds its way to expansion, and public policies to foster production and citizenship are not accessed. In the latter case, the non-implementation of public policies ends up perpetuating cycles of poverty, violence and social exclusion. Among the policies that are not being accessed in the PAs due to lack of land regularization are agricultural credit programs, such as the National Program for Strengthening Family Agriculture (PRONAF) and rural housing programs such as Minha Casa, Minha Vida Rural .

The main instrument for securing the land and land rights of traditional communities is the "Real Use Right Concession Agreement" (CCDRU), popularly called the "title" riparian and extractivist. This instrument is provided for in the SNUC law as the main land regularization mechanism for sustainable use PAs, such as RESEXs and FLONAs.

The non-regularization of land tenure of UCs constitutes today one of the biggest obstacles to the implementation of the objectives and mission of these territorial units. Most PAs were enacted as a policy to contain deforestation and socioenvironmental justice in areas of expansion of the agricultural and cattle breeding frontier, thus weakened by land disputes and lack of definition. For years, civil society and representative organizations of the traditional populations have struggled to solve the problem through regularization of land, but it is a process so complex and slow that often seems impossible to happen given.

While land regularization does not take place, traditional families and communities are left out of their most basic territorial rights and access to public policies because they do not have an official document that guarantees the effective right over a collective territory already demarcated. Land tenure insecurity limits the possibilities for development of traditional resident communities, affects the generation of income and the economic activities practiced by these populations. Although the lack of resources is an argument frequently used to justify the lack of land regularization, the greatest obstacles are political (power arrangements) and governance (articulation between state entities).

In seeking solutions to this systemic and structural problem, civil society organizations such as community associations and NGOs have engaged for years in negotiation processes. The most recent initiative in this regard was the "Amazon Dialogue Forum", whose genesis, process of mobilization and institutional composition is discussed at the next session.

3 MOBILIZATION EXPERIENCES: SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE SPACES

After the struggle for the decree of protected areas, which sought to guarantee the right of access to land and its resources and at the same time to disseminate a territorial model that contemplated the multiplicity of uses and forms of reproduction of these riverine and extractive populations, forced to invest in a new phase of mobilizations and demands in search of solutions to land problems so complex that threatened the environmental, social and economic viability of PAs.

Until the year 2012 the attempts of the extractivist leaderships and organizations of Amazonas, in the sense of obtaining the land regularization of their territories, were resulting in an accumulation of frustrations. The lack of knowledge about the real land tenure of the units represented a practically insurmountable obstacle and limited not only the performance of the leaderships but also the responsible public bodies themselves.

The lack of a geo-referenced information base that unified the cartographic data of the territorial units (federal, state and municipal areas, private areas, vacant lands, etc.) that affect UCs prevented any move toward regularization. The lack of clarity about the land configuration of the PAs led the leaders to demand from federal agencies the land regularization of lands of state lands and vice versa. The demands of the extractivists who came to the land agencies were often referred to other instances without plausible answers being given to solve the problem.

For several years, the extractivists were pressuring and claiming land regularization, in a movement that did not have the recognition by parts of the land agencies. They always claimed that the issue was "complicated" and that, however committed they might be, they would not achieve results. Within the state apparatus, the initiatives of some well-meaning servants were wrecked by bureaucratic inertia, lack of political will, and legal and operational tools capable of delivering timely solutions. Demands for land regularization and resolution of territorial conflicts also reached the State and Federal Public Prosecutions, but in a pulverized manner and without the correct characterization and technical qualification, which limited the scope of prosecutors' performance.

Within civil society, organizations such as the Pastoral Land Commission, the National Council of Extractive Populations and community associations have carried out in recent years a cycle of mobilizations, events and public debates in order to tackle the land problem of PAs.

In 2011, the CNS organized, on the Island of Marajó, "I Called of the Peoples of the Forest", which put in the agenda to the representatives of the government present several extractivist demands, being the most urgent and debated was the land regularization of the federal CUs, as a condition of access to public policies. The "II Call of the Peoples of the Forest" was held in 2013, and the same claims were made to the debate table, new charges were made, however without the effective return by the government authorities.

Also in 2011, the "Forum for the Sustainable Development of Boca do Acre", with the support of the IEB, held the "1st Seminar on Land Tenure Regularization of Boca do Acre". Among the various situations and

land conflicts discussed at the event, the situation of the municipality's CUs was highlighted, as was the case with the private titles covering RESEX Arapixi, a matter that was widely discussed. The seminar also inaugurated a methodology of work that included the realization of a diagnosis of the land situation by the leaders themselves and the realization and a "round table" with representatives of the various land agencies and construction of an agenda of commitments and practical guidelines.

In 2012 an important event took place, the "I Regional Meeting of Counselors of the Units of Conservation of the Middle and High Solimões" with presence of leaders of the south of the Amazon, space of action of the IEB. The contexts were different, but at that time there was a concern that united the communities of the PAs: since 2005, a resolution of the Court of Auditors of the Union (CFU) pressured the INCRA not to release credits of the agrarian reform, to which the communities were entitled, without proper land regularization of PAs; this made the theme a challenge and a priority for all.

The "Seminar on land regularization of Lábrea", which took place from 05 to 07 May 2012, as part of the activities of the land regularization GT, organized by local institutions, with the support of IEB, to establish agendas of commitments around the land issue with the communities. Representatives from eight regions of the municipalities of Lábrea, Canutama and Tapauá met in the event to identify and propose solutions to areas of land conflicts in the Lábrea region and to organize proposals for actions for the governmental institutions present: SPU, FUNAI, ICMBio, Terra Legal / MDA, INCRA and ITEAM

In the case of the South of Amazonas, a watershed in the debate on the land regularization of PAs was the strong involvement of the IEB in this agenda. Already in 2011, the organization had mobilized the consultant Katia Carneiro to advise on the "1st Seminary of Land Tenure Regularization of Boca do Acre". Based on the publication "Tracks of land regularization for Communities in the Amazonian Forests" (Carneiro et al., 2013), the IEB team directed the local leaders in the realization of an urban land diagnosis based on the information then available. A partnership with GIZ, through the experts Heliandro Maia and Taiguara Alencar, favored the systematization and presentation and discussion of the official information on the local and regional land situation, and at first, they brought important contributions, mainly with regard to socialization of the bases cartographic and successful experiences of other regions and states of the Amazon.

The methodology tested in Boca do Acre was replicated in the "Seminar on Regularization of Lábrea Land" in 2012. At that time, it was created by the Land Settlement Working Group with the responsibility to receive, systematize and address the demands of local organizations and communities. In this way, the IEB

focused its methodological strategy on the creation of multisectoral public spaces for the negotiation of aggregate demands with the land tenure organs. In doing so, the institution sought to internalize and disseminate the experiences of land regularization promoted by civil society organizations in the State of Pará since the late 1990s (Santos et al., 2006; Carvalheiro et al., 2013).

Ao longo de dez anos de atuação no sul do Amazonas, o IEB adquiriu experiência na construção destes espaços de negociação em ambientes de extrema complexidade e em meio a conflitos de diversas ordens. Fóruns, grupos de trabalho e redes são considerados pelo IEB instrumentos de fortalecimento político das organizações da base da sociedade civil nos territórios da Amazônia onde acontece a luta social protagonizada por indígenas, ribeirinhos e agricultores familiares num processo contínuo e sempre inconcluso, mas necessário.

Os intensos aprendizados obtidos nos eventos locais e regionais e a crescente mobilização das organizações extrativistas em torno da regularização fundiária das UCs culminaram com a definição de uma estratégia inovadora para o contexto do Amazonas: a viabilização de um fórum de âmbito estadual no qual as demandas dos extrativistas pudessem ser tratadas de maneira agregada, onde os diversos órgãos fundiários deveriam ter assento.

Devido à conhecida ineficiência dos órgãos fundiários – muitos dos quais já estavam, há tempos, a par dos conflitos e demandas envolvidas - um dos encaminhamentos discutidos nos fóruns locais e regionais foi o de estender os convites dos próximos eventos aos Ministérios Públicos Federal (MPF) e Estadual (MPE). Esta decisão nascia da frustração com as negociações iniciadas anteriormente e apontavam para uma possível judicialização coletiva da questão fundiária das UCs.

Depois de algumas reuniões e tratativas preliminares, as organizações IEB, CPT e CNS decidiram lançar a proposta do “Fórum Diálogo Amazonas”: regularização fundiária urgente!” como uma nova estratégia para o enfrentamento de um velho problema. Na próxima seção será discutida a natureza e o significado deste fórum, tanto em relação ao processo de criação e implementação, quanto aos seus resultados práticos.

4 THE "AMAZON DIALOGUE FORUM": A BRASILIAN LAND REGULARIZATION INICIATIVE

Ensuring territorial and land rights for the poor in the Amazon has become the object of concern and struggle of a wide range of social actors such as peoples and institutions, including civil society organizations, social movements and the State. Despite many important efforts and achievements, there is

still a lack of a defined property arrangement, land regularization and domain documentation for the Brazilian Amazon which can guarantee the effectiveness and fulfillment of traditional populations' rights.

In the 21st century, land tenure chaos is the rule in Brazilian Amazon. Local communities struggle for territorial rights is still far from over the goal. We are seeing just the opposite: land insecurity and territorial conflicts are the usual situation in traditional people's lives. This encompasses all kind of violence and threats, including the effects derived from deforestation and predatory natural resources exploitation.

Considering this background the "Amazonas Dialog Forum" (ADF) was created in 2012. It arised from efforts done by three civil society organizations: Brazil's International Education Institute (IEB), Land Pastoral Commission (CPT) and National Council for Extractive Populations (CNS).. Its approach is focused on bringing together to the same table national and state land agencies responsible for land regularization in Amazonas state. ADF counts with Amazonas State Attorney (PGE/AM) legal advice and mediation from Brazilian Government's Agency for Law Enforcement and Crimes Prosecution (MPF/AM).

The objective of the Forum is to promote land regularization within the boundaries of Protected Areas categorized as Sustainable Use in the Amazonas State. In Brazil, there are two broad categories of Protected Areas allowing people to live in: the Extractive Reserves (RESEX) and National Forests (FLONA). The conception of these categories aimed to ensure full social, economic and environmental rights for traditional peoples residents, and for helping to promote the protagonism of traditional, extractive populations.

Its specific objectives are: (i) to promote the consolidation and territorial planning of Sustainable Use Conservation Units; (ii) promote land regularization (i) be an environment of participation and social mobilization; (ii) promote inter-governmental dialogue (federal and state bodies) and inter-sectoral dialogue (Executive, Judiciary and Social Movement); (iv) to propose quicker, more articulate and quick administrative and legal solutions; and (v) to improve governance arrangements among State landowners. Its dynamics is based on semestral wide plenary sessions with Brazilian state land agencies and community representatives, interspersed by monthly meetings of the Amazonas Dialogue working group (GT), led by the Brazilian Government's Agency for Law Enforcement and Crimes Prosecution (MPF/AM). These seasonal instances of encounter and articulation seeks to exercise social control over public land policies, and aim to provide solutions for issues related to the theme.

The "Amazon Dialogue Forum" has proved to be an effective governance instrument, because it promotes a platform for confrontation, cooperation and land conflicts resolution, as well as a methodological, political

and procedural innovation framework in the Amazonian land context. It elevated the interlocution level between society and State, creating ideal conditions to secure traditional people territorial rights, which were under threat. The results achieved so far are not finalistic - the land issue in the Brazilian Amazon is huge and complex -, however, the Forum contributed to generate jurisprudence, parameters and procedural rites which would be unthinkable until the moment of its creation. This initiative is a success case and points out paths that can be traced on Brazilian Amazon land chaos.

Through the initiative, in just two years, since 2014, and with the holding of four large semiannual plenary sessions, in addition to the regular monitoring of the WG monthly meetings, relations, processes and legal solutions were built that favored the following points:

1. On June 5, 2014, the governor of the state of Amazonas, José Melo, signed the Concession Agreements for Real Use Right (CCDRU) on behalf of six associations representing communities living in Extractive Reserves (Medium Extractive Reserve Juruá, Baixo Juruá, Auati-Paraná, Rio Jutaí, Rio Unini and Medio Purus). The event crowned two years of intense dialogue and negotiations that required the engagement and coordination of efforts among various segments of the state bureaucracy, breaking the inertia of the land tenure organs, at both the federal and state levels. With this action 1,468 families were benefited, corresponding to approximately 2,301,254.00 there are regularized, with coverage in nine municipalities of the state of Amazonas (Carauari, Juruá, Uarini, Fonte Boa, Jutaí, Barcelos, Lábrea, Pauini and Tapauá);
2. Guarantee of land security, preventing the dispute of territories between alleged owners or grileiros of public lands and the traditional populations inhabiting the PAs;
3. Promotion of access to public policies, since one of the conditions for obtaining credit for the promotion of agro-extractive production is land regularization;
4. The consolidation of the objectives of these units, with obvious gains for the conservation of biodiversity;
5. Effectiveness and legitimacy of a public space that encompasses the various organs related to the land issue, overcoming the internal fragmentation of government action. The result was the construction of a common, focused and structuring agenda among diverse actors;
6. With the construction of a new paradigm in land tenure regularization, consolidating a public space for negotiation, the "Amazon Dialogue Forum" proposed legal procedural innovations in a political-administrative environment where no one dared to do so.
7. Inter-institutional learning, in which the government actors involved learned to understand better and overcome the ties of public power
8. The participation of representative PA organizations with a qualified and politically engaged intervention;

9. The construction of an interinstitutional format and arrangement of governance, with social control by organized civil society that can be replicated in states where land tenure situations are similar

As a process, the "Amazon Dialogue Forum" takes place at different scales or levels: both in time (in a seasonal and continuous way) and in space (mobilization of the actors in the PAs and municipalities of the interior of the state, in addition to the capital Manaus). In a transversal way, the articulation, discussion and evaluation of the initiative is carried out in a way that involves the extractive and riparian representations of the PAs of sustainable use in the decision making in relation to their land problems and that are in different stages of resolution, varying from UC to UC.

To this end, this involvement is currently taking place among local actors (managers of PAs and representatives of community associations of PAs) through thematic meetings held at the grassroots level; between the federal and state entities of the State, through monthly meetings led by the MPF-AM, called "GT-Dialogues" meetings (here it is important to mention that besides the presence of the State, there is always the participation of civil society institutions initiative: IEB, CNS and CPT); and in the formation of the public space itself, through the semiannual plenary sessions called the "Amazon Dialogue Forum", which likewise counts on the moderation of the MPF - an important partner of the initiative.

There are many open questions and issues to be resolved today. The problems have not yet been exhausted. Effective referrals and concrete resolutions are in place and require co-participation among government entities that have competence in relation to the land issue. For example, for the guarantee of an integral CCDRU, which covers the whole UC and not only fractions or regularized parcels, it is necessary that the Secretariat of Patrimony of the Union (UPS) approve and assign the areas of várzea, first, to the ICMBio and, secondly, ICMBio for UC associations. This process has been slow and requires resolute positioning by the federal government; two extractive reserves and three national forests are in the process of regularizing their areas, increasing the positive impact of the initiative; the transfer of land from the Union to MMA / ICMBio, so that in three FLONAs and two RESEXs the ICMBio could already grant the CCDRU to the communities; and in the case of state UCs, the CCDRUs still need to undergo a legal process of reversing their term of validity: from 05 years, to indeterminate term.

As for replication, the National Council of Extractive Populations (CNS) is seeking to disseminate the experience in other states of the Amazon with CUs in similar land situations - Rondônia, Pará and Roraima specifically. The importance of the Amazonas Dialogue is great for these organizations because it presents

itself as a successful paradigm of access to the public policy of land regularization, a theme so vital to the region.

The Amazonas Dialogue deals with a strategy focused on effectiveness and resolution. It proposes the debate in the public space and reflects a certain conjuncture of territorial conflict that demands a solution.

The solutions found for the impasses were not always the ones planned or those that were already ready. Each institution had its limitations, and new strategies and negotiations were required for each new situation. The actors involved were sure that no one had the perfect solution, that the solution was not in the manuals, but that it should be built together.

Faced with the inactivity of the state, the communities reacted and succeeded in articulating the forces that were acting within the process in their favor. An effective State is one that improves the lives of people, who can fulfill their legal duties and capillary public policies. Such effectiveness was due to the leadership of community leaders and civil society organizations that participated in the "Amazon Dialogue Forum". In alliance with the MPF, these leaders put the State to move in a tone of solutions.

As with every negotiation, some side always has to give way. But there was something greater than that: the cooperation of all the participating institutions that, at some point, yielded at some point. The role of the MPF and PGE was instrumental in this process by "putting communities on an equal footing" with state land agencies.