

Dear Sir

Francisco Cali Tzay

Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

Responding to the Special Rapporteur’s request to contribute with the thematic report “**Recuperation from COVID-19 and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples,”** to be presented at the 48th Session of the Human Rights Council, we are pleased to send information on indigenous initiatives for tackling COVID-19 in the region of Amapá and the north of Pará, in Brazil, as well as the actions of the Brazilian state.

**Introduction –** The policies for confronting COVID-19 in Brazil have been considered disastrous by indigenous leaders and organizations, as well as by researchers and specialists working in diverse areas (doctors, epidemiologists, anthropologists, economists). The intense disarray of the actions taken by the various agencies of the Brazilian state, the lack of clear guidelines from the Ministry of Health concerning the current situation of the pandemic, and the absence of concrete policies have conspired to generate a calamitous situation for the Brazilian population in general and indigenous peoples in particular.

Currently Brazil has exceeded the toll of 250,000 deaths since the start of the pandemic and has maintained the worst daily death rate for the last 30 days at least. Included in this statistic are 970 people from diverse indigenous groups who lost their life due to COVID-19, as per the survey of the Articulation of the Indigenous Peoples of Brazil (APIB).[[1]](#footnote-1)

The relaxing of the containment measures between the end of 2020 and the start of 2021, the almost regular functioning of businesses and the air of normality exuded by government statements have contributed to increased rates of infection and mortality in most Brazilian states. Various analyses have indicated a worsening of the epidemiological scenario of the pandemic, especially in the North region of the country where 60% of its indigenous population is located. The emergence of new variants of Sars-Cov-2 makes this scenario even more worrying. In Amazonas state alone, more than 250 genomes have already been sequenced. Some recently published studies (Fiocruz 2020; Hallal et al. 2020; Ranzani et al. 2021) indicate a worsening trend of the epidemic among Brazil’s indigenous populations, in relation to both the risk of infection, and the evolution towards serious illness and death.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Responding to this scenario, diverse actions led by civil society, the indigenous movements, researchers, indigenous organizations, and non-governmental organizations have been essential in terms of mitigating the impacts of the pandemic on indigenous peoples in Brazil. Among these initiatives, we can highlight the action organized by APIB in conjunction with six political parties (PSB, PSOL, PCdoB, Rede, PT, PDT), which gave rise to the process of the Claim of Noncompliance with a Fundamental Precept (*Arguição de Descumprimento de Preceito Fundamental*: ADPF) 709 in the Federal Supreme Court (STF), which pointed to the federal government’s omission in the fight against COVID-19 among the indigenous population, whose first decision dates from July 8, 2020. To date, the COVID-19 Response Plan for Brazilian Indigenous Peoples, which was demanded by the Federal Supreme Court (STF), has not been endorsed by the latter due to insufficient data and diverse inconsistencies on the part of the Brazilian government.

Notably, although seven months have passed since the first legal injunction relating to this action, the group of specialists formed by researchers from diverse areas concluded that: *“there is still no detailed and consistent operational plan to ensure the control of viral dissemination, the support needed for the social isolation of indigenous communities, and the assistance and monitoring for COVID-19 as a whole*.*”[[3]](#footnote-3)*

It is worth emphasizing that the Brazilian indigenous movement, despite showing its openness to dialogue, was not consulted by the government about the specific needs and cares relating to the assistance given to each people and the local strategies for tackling the pandemic in each indigenous context. The discussion spaces later promoted by the Federal Public Prosecutor’s Office (*Ministério Público Federal*: MPF) were more a venue for the government agencies to present their plans than a forum for joint consultation and construction of strategies for confronting the pandemic. Remote participation reduced the possibility for indigenous peoples to be involved, essential to the construction of collective and effective agreements between the different peoples and the government agencies.

Below, responding to the items proposed by the esteemed Special Rapporteur, we present general and specific contributions based on the area of activity of Iepé (Indigenous Training and Research Institute: *Instituto de Pesquisa e Formação Indígena*), an indigenist organization that has been working for more twenty years among the indigenous peoples of Amapá and the north of Pará, Brazil – in order to elaborate the COVID-19 Recovery Report.

**Questions 1,2,3 and 4 - Impact of the COVID-19 recovery laws and policies on indigenous peoples**

Following the example of other countries around the world, in Brazil emergency measures were adopted for managing the economic crisis generated by the COVID-19 pandemic. This response, which resulted in extraordinary disbursements, almost all of them temporary, was possible thanks to the Brazilian Congress’s approval of the so-called ‘war budget’ through Conditional Amendment 106, issued on 7 May 2020.[[4]](#footnote-4) The main policies for economic recovery and protection of vulnerable populations adopted in Brazil were emergency aid or emergency basic income, the expansion of loans to micro, small and medium-sized businesses (MPMEs) guaranteed by the Treasury, and an expansionist monetary policy.[[5]](#footnote-5)

Despite the existence of a government plan to protect the lands, territories, and resources of indigenous peoples against invasions and land grabs during the phase of economic recovery from COVID-19, most of the initiatives related to this question have been executed by the indigenous peoples themselves, give that the agencies responsible for implementation and control of the measures have recently experienced an intense process of destructuring.

**Economic policies with specific impacts for indigenous populations**

Among the policies for mitigating the effects of the economic crisis on indigenous populations, we can highlight the granting of emergency aid and the distribution of basic food packages, both coordinated by FUNAI (the federal indigenous support agency). Despite being measures with a positive impact, especially for those living in urban areas or in non-homologated indigenous reservations, the lack of adequate planning for these actions produced unnecessary risks for the populations, contributing to the spread of the pandemic in some Indigenous Lands (*Terras Indígenas*).

**Emergency aid –** The granting of emergency benefit reached around 66 million people in Brazil and was has proven relatively important for indigenous communities. According to government data, more than 151,000 indigenous people were assisted by the aid measure. Despite the positive impacts generated by this policy, diverse recommendations were made by the MPF to the government for improving the ways in which people could register for the program and receive the benefit (through specific applications, even for those without bank accounts), as well as assuring payment locations close to indigenous villages.  Even so, many indigenous people were forced to travel to towns during the pandemic, facing queues and increasing the risk of contamination.

In the Oiapoque region, where the Uaçá, Juminã and Galibi Indigenous Lands are located, home to the Aparai, Galibi Ka´lina, Galibi Marworno and Karipuna peoples, who have a combined population of around 10,000 people, no special measures were taken to improve access. The difficulties were numerous in terms of both access to the benefit and the receipt of the funds. Although the emergency aid is needed to ensure food security – given the difficulties imposed by the pandemic – the lack of adaptation of the policy generated negative effects since it exponentially increased the flow of indigenous people to the towns, both to register for the benefit (considering that there is no internet access or mobile phone coverage in the villages and not everyone has a mobile) and to receive it. The bank branches and stores became the focal point for large crowds and sources of contamination. Furthermore, the lack of information on the calendars and models of payment for the benefits led to unnecessary land and river journeys to the town and problems in terms of both prolonged stay in the urban area and difficulties returning to the Indigenous Lands. In an attempt to ameliorate these problems, the Council of Leaders of the Indigenous Peoples of the Oiapoque (CCPIO) sent diverse documents to the Federal Public Prosecutor’s Office (MPF) on the difficulties in accessing and receiving the benefits, as well as to branches of the Caixa Econômica bank, asking them to adapt the benefits policy to indigenous peoples through, for instance, prior scheduling of dates for attending to this population and/or payment in locations closer to the villages. But none of the requests were met.

Indigenous peoples like the Wajãpi, Aparai, Tiriyó, Wayana, Kataxuyana and Waiwai (from Amapá and the north of Pará), by protecting themselves by remaining in their territories, mostly ended up not accessing the benefit.

Representatives of all the indigenous peoples of Amapá and the north of Pará were invited to take part in specific meetings for monitoring actions in response to COVID-19 in conjunction with the MPF, FUNAI and the Amapá and North Pará Special Indigenous Health District (*Distrito Sanitário Especial Indígena*: DSEI). But despite this issue being on the agenda, little progress was made, meaning that not all the eligible population was able to receive the benefit and those who did ran the risk of contamination in the towns.

It should be emphasized that even with the pandemic in full force, the government ended the granting of emergency aid and there are no concrete plans for the benefit’s resumption. There are many indigenous peoples living in a risk situation and who indeed need this assistance, especially to guarantee their food security.

**Food security policy -** In the context of the pandemic, the action prioritized by the federal government to guarantee the food security of indigenous peoples was the distribution of basic food packages, coordinated by the National Indian Foundation (FUNAI). This policy omitted to consider the specific needs of each people, the adaptation of the types of food to be distributed, as well as the development of local initiatives that guarantee food security in the medium to long term. This action was not planned or consulted with indigenous peoples and the criteria for selecting the benefitting families were left unclear.

In Amapá and the north of Pará, according to the Federal Government Plan, in 2020 a total of 979 food packages were delivered to indigenous families and the delivery of another1,957 food packages is anticipated. This quantity, however, has been considered insufficient by the region’s indigenous peoples, who have turned to other civil society partners to ensure the food security of the families.

In agreement with regional indigenous organizations, the Iepé Institute distributed more than 6,500 basic food packages and purchased bags of flour produced by the region’s indigenous peoples (who had been unable to sell their produce) and distributed them to other indigenous peoples. It also acquired equipment and inputs for fishing and agriculture to strengthen traditional productive practices and ensure the continued habitation and sustenance of indigenous communities within their territories.

Finally, it is worth highlighting that indigenous peoples, especially those living in more vulnerable contexts who are dependent on processed food, given the worsening of the pandemic, may end up facing a situation of food insecurity. This is because the monthly distribution of food packages by the government in 2021, scheduled to begin in January, is dependent on resources that, according to the government itself, have not yet been made available.[[6]](#footnote-6)

**Protection of the lands, territories, and resources of indigenous peoples**

Two important actions were conducted autonomously by the indigenous peoples of this region, both of which merit being registered: the implementation of Sanitary Barriers to contain the epidemic and the policy to control invasions of Indigenous Lands.

**Sanitary Barriers -** Containment barriers are a fundamental action for protecting indigenous territories and minimizing the risks of disease transmission, especially during the pandemic. Despite the elaboration of a Barrier Implementation Plan and the containment of invaders, this action was undertaken in many localities by the indigenous peoples themselves with the support of partner organizations without the support of specific government measures.

In the Oiapoque region, the CCPIO (Council of Leaders of the Indigenous Peoples of the Oiapoque) organized a control barrier on the side road providing access to Manga Village, the main entry to the villages in the Uaçá Indigenous Land. The barrier was instituted in March 2020 and initially non-indigenous peoples were prohibited from entering the indigenous territory (apart from health professionals). Subsequently, the barrier also prohibited the entry and exit of indigenous people, looking to reduce the flux to the urban areas. Later, rules were established for leaving, aiming to allow access to social benefits and wages, and later still the barrier was turned into a control post rather than blocking access. Currently, the barrier remains active and only those who present a vaccination card can pass. The barrier was maintained with Iepé’s support and at various moments received one-off support from the DSEI. Additionally, in the regions of the BR156 and the Oiapoque River, where the villages are more exposed, signs were put up barring entry and gates were installed to prevent entry by outsiders.

In the Wajãpi Indigenous Land (TIW) at the start of April 2020, two indigenous associations, the Council of Wajãpi Villages (Apina) and the Wajãpi Land, Environment and Culture Association (Awatac) they decided to organize a work rally to construct a gate on the access road to the Indigenous Land as a measure to prevent the traffic of people and cars during the pandemic. After construction of the gate, a key was given to the DSEI team, another to FUNAI and another two were kept by the Wajãpi organizations – one at the TIW and another with the advisors living in the city of Macapá. With the closure of the road, the transit of unauthorized cars in the Indigenous Land was interrupted and the travelling of the Wajãpi outside the Indigenous Land diminished significantly. This measure for restricting circulation was essential to avoiding community transmission of the virus within the population. Currently use of the gate has become more flexible, though it continues to serve as an alert that the pandemic has not ended.

In the Tumucumaque region, in the north of Pará, two barrier plans, one regional, “city-indigenous territories-city,” the other cross-border (Brazil-Suriname), reflecting the kinship network and frequent transit between the indigenous peoples of Brazil and the south of Suriname. The regional plan basically consisted of controlling the circulation of flights (the only means of access to Tumucumaque), controlling river circulation (the only means of access to Trombetas), testing, assessment by the health team, the installation of Primary Care Units in strategic villages for healthcare provision. The cross-border plan, for its part relied on the intensification of communication through the internet, radio and satellite telephone, the installation of information signs located on specific points of the borders, warning about the dangers of the pandemic and the importance of avoiding circulation between villages at this moment, and the production and dissemination of a video on territorial protection in a pandemic context in close coordination with Suriname.[[7]](#footnote-7)

In the Trombetas region, the indigenous peoples sought to develop strategies to reduce circulation, principally between city and village. During certain periods, therefore, the people were banned from travelling and social distancing protocols were established. These measures led to many families from the larger villages moving to more remote localities. This movement was called “Alternative Cultural Isolation.”

These strategies were and remain essential in terms of remembering that the pandemic is still happening, and of effectively reducing the circulation of people and minimizing the risks of contamination. Both were autonomous initiatives of the region’s indigenous peoples.

**Monitoring: controlling invasions of Indigenous Lands –** According to data from the Pastoral Land Commission (*Comissão Pastoral da Terra*: CPT), at least 97 indigenous areas were invaded during 2020 by diverse sectors of the population (loggers, miners, land grabbers). To give an idea of the intensification of this process, the CPT identified nine invasions in 2019. This is clearly an indication that, under the current federal government, anti-indigenous groups have felt free to ignore and breach indigenous rights won over decades.

One of the government sectors most involved in undermining indigenous rights is the Environment Ministry under the administration of Ricardo Salles. Widely known for having used in a government meeting the expression “while everyone is focusing attention on the pandemic, we’re going to set loose the herd,” the current Environment Minister has been the mentor of a series of measures that have precipitated a relaxation of national environmental policy (publication of the “Interim Measure on Land Grabbing”; amnesty for illegal loggers,  the dismantling of IBAMA and blocking its employees from working actively in environmental protection, etc.). As the Indigenous Lands border either large farms or still protected forests, this entire process of relaxing environmental protection policy ends up stimulating the intensification of environmental degradation in the areas surrounding the lands, while also serving to stimulate the invasion of the same.

In the case of the Indigenous Lands where Iepé is active, the indigenous peoples have perceived suspicious movements of airplanes, especially over the Tumucumaque complex and in the Trombetas region. An invasion of the Tiriyó territory was observed in mid 2020 on the frontier between Brazil and Suriname, and a clandestine landing strip a few kilometers from some Tiriyó villages in Brazil. This situation produced a mobilization and joint action of the Tiriyó of Suriname and Brazil to deactivate the clandestine strip and prevent any return of the invaders.

In the Trombetas region, the indigenous peoples reported invasions on two borders of the territory: in the Roraima portion and on the border of the Kaxuyana/Tunayana territory. In the former case, the indigenous peoples have mobilized to demand effective actions from the inspection and control agencies and also created, on their own account, a surveillance post to prevent the advance of the prospectors. In the Kaxuyana/ Tunayana portion, meanwhile, in September 2020, invasions of recreational fishing tourists were reported. To date none of these invasions has been resolved.

In the Oiapoque region, indigenous peoples have also reported invasions for illegal fishing, especially at the mouth of the Uaçá River and in the Encruzo region. Meanwhile, in the Wajãpi Indigenous Land, hunters and fishermen have made constant invasions, especially in the regions of the Ari River and Riozinho. There are also reports of unidentified invasions, which the Wajãpi suspect are by prospectors in the Mukuru and Inipuku regions, not yet verified by the federal authorities.

As a form of curbing and/or recording these invasions as the basis for making denunciations to the inspection agencies, the indigenous peoples have conducted surveillance expeditions with some regularity and at their own initiative. However, in relation to those denunciations already made, actions from the public authorities are still awaited.

**Questions 4 and 5 - Participation and inclusion of indigenous peoples in the state COVID-19 recovery plans**

In general, the Brazilian state has displayed considerable difficulties in dialoguing with indigenous communities in the elaboration of the plans for confronting and recovering from COVID-19. There is a complete lack of dialogue on the part of the Brazilian government with the organizations representing indigenous peoples. The inclusion of indigenous peoples among priority groups for the beginning of the COVID-19 vaccination campaign in Brazil is, without doubt, a significant advance in the policy for protecting these peoples. However, this conquest was the result of APIB’s legal action presented to the Federal Supreme Court.

**Vaccination -** Despite the guarantee of inclusion in the priority group, vaccination in Indigenous Lands has presented problems that have had a significant impact on the results obtained so far. The process has been impacted by the non-existence of a clear plan of communication or of institutional actions for combating the spread of fake news in the villages. The elaboration and dissemination of communication projects related to vaccination, addressed to the general population and to indigenous peoples, is an already well-established strategy of public health programs to enable the expansion of vaccine coverage. To date the government has made no use of this strategy to convince the population, indigenous or otherwise.

The logistical planning of vaccination initiatives, which are not specified in detail in either the plan for confronting COVID-19 among Brazilian indigenous peoples or in the National Immunization Plan, has generated significant negative impacts on vaccine coverage in different regions of the country. There has been no concern on the part of the Multidisciplinary Indigenous Health Team to promote culturally appropriate vaccination actions, paying attention to local practices, collective memory of epidemics and vaccination campaigns, audiovisual and printed materials in the indigenous languages. There has also been no attempt by the government to present a detailed account of population size and vaccination plans for indigenous peoples living in non-homologated lands or in urban contexts.

Generally speaking, there has been no involvement of indigenous organizations and communities in the elaboration of vaccinations plans. This lack of local articulation, combined with the extensive dissemination of fake news, can be identified as reasons for the low take-up of the vaccination campaign in Indigenous Lands seen to date.

The above problems can be exemplified in the vaccine coverage attained one month after the start of the campaign. Despite the availability of vaccines and the rapid spread of the pandemic in the North region of Brazil, just 58% of the target indigenous population in Brazil (aged of 18, excluding pregnant and nursing women) have received the first dose of the vaccine and 17% the second. In the area covered by the Amapá and North of Pará DSEI, 59% of the target population has received the first dose and 4% the second. In the Alto Rio Negro DSEI region, located in Amazonas state, just 8% of the target population received the first dose of the vaccine and 0% the second, based on data available on February 24, 2021.[[8]](#footnote-8)

With the federal government’s failure to conduct specific communication projects, it was left to indigenous organizations to assume and create strategies to pass on correct information concerning the vaccine, its assurances and limitations. Use of radio communications and the internet facilitated this process.

Iepé,in partnership with local indigenous organizations, has been working intensely since January to combat fake news and raise awareness about the importance of vaccination for indigenous peoples, using videos, testimonies and WhatsApp audio messages, which enabled vaccine coverage in some areas, like the Wajãpi Indigenous Land, to reach close to 90% of the target population in the first dose.

**Questions 6 and 7 - Collection and divulgation of data**

Information is one of the central elements in the analysis of health situations and, given the current scenario of the COVID-19 pandemic, is fundamental to the organization of services, planning of actions, and evaluation of the effectiveness of the policies implemented both by the relevant agencies and by indigenous organizations.

In relation to this question, some serious problems can be identified in terms of both the production of data (notifications) and its availability from the Ministry of Health via the Indigenous Healthcare Information System (*Sistema de Informação da Atenção à Saúde Indígena*: SIASI). As well as the failure to implement a national monitoring system for COVID-19 cases and deaths, there exists no structured government initiative to incorporate more precise georeferenced systems (GPSs, trackers) with the epidemiological monitoring systems aimed at indigenous populations.

**Data production -** In relation to producing information, a clear difficulty exists in terms of implementing reliable testing processes (RT-PCR) in diverse regions of the country, a situation worsened in remote and difficult to access areas, making the official results of COVID-19 incidence fairly unreliable. Furthermore, SESAI does not include cases and deaths of indigenous people living in urban areas in its official data. It is also worth noting that the data on race/color in COVID-19 notifications were included in the national information system only in April 2020, after pressure from diverse sectors of society.

**Data availability –** The lack of available data from the federal government for the purposes of analyzing and monitoring the pandemic has been heavily questioned by indigenous organizations and research centers throughout Brazil from the presentation of the first version of the Federal Government’s COVID-19 Response Plan. To mitigate this fact, the Articulation of Indigenous Peoples of Brazil (*Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil*: APIB), along with its partners from the indigenist field, set up a monitoring and notification system parallel to the official one (https://emergenciaindigena.apiboficial.org). The network of indigenous organizations spread throughout the country has supplied the data presented by APIB. In this system, unlike the official one, the number of peoples affected by the pandemic is presented, including the data relating to indigenous people living in urban contexts, outside Indigenous Lands and in lands that have been retaken but not yet homologated.

In the specific case of the indigenous peoples of Amapá and the north of Pará, the problems that have been reported by indigenous organizations include difficulty in accessing updated information from the DSEI and notifications abouts cases. Consequently, parallel registers are being produced both by local indigenous organizations and by healthcare professionals who work at the base poles. It is worth emphasizing that the extraofficial data differ greatly from the official data presented by the DSEI. The local of quality information by base pole, especially in the Oiapoque region, as hindered comprehension of the real dimension of the pandemic in different areas and among different peoples. Moreover, the lack of tests has also underestimated the scale of the pandemic among the indigenous peoples of Amapá and the north of Pará, along with other regions of the country.

Despite this precarious situation, Iepé has assumed the task of disseminating weekly epidemiological bulletins with a register of cases updated using data from the municipality, the DSEI and indigenous organizations. Produced by various Iepé programs, the bulletins – in addition to the data on the indigenous peoples – also present relevant and qualified information on the pandemic in the region as a whole. These bulletins are distributed via the internet to the indigenous communities themselves to alert them about the evolution of the pandemic in their territories.

**Questions 8 and 9 - COVID-19 responses of the indigenous peoples and recovery efforts**

Generally speaking, the state policies and health system have collaborated little with indigenous organizations in responding to the pandemic. Traditional practices were also not incorporated by the healthcare system, though this did not prevent them from being used by indigenous peoples. It is important to emphasize that although the indigenous healthcare legislation guarantees indigenous peoples culturally appropriate care, respecting their diverse forms of social organization, knowledge and practices, the implementation of this policy is still far from being effective. The knowledge and practices specific to these peoples are not taken into consideration – whether due to ignorance or prejudice – by the healthcare teams working in Indigenous Lands.

**Traditional practices –** The pandemic allowed indigenous peoples to perceive that biomedical knowledge is limited and that the research on Sars-Cov-2 and its mutations, the different effects of coronavirus variants on bodies, people’s specific resistances and fragilities, and the possibilities of treatment are all still becoming known. In the absence of an effective biomedical solution and faced with these uncertainties, indigenous peoples have reinforced their traditional practices, such as the use of medicinal plants and homemade remedies, consultation of shamans, specific prayers and chants, bathing, oils, infusions, herbal teas, and innumerable other forms of care with the body. This revival has allowed young people, through their experts, to access these bodies of knowledge and practices that had been lying dormant in many communities.

**Indigenous-led strategies –** Another important strategy for tackling the pandemic was the revival of patterns of geographic dispersal of families across Indigenous Lands. Some practices constitutive of the traditional way of life of the Wajãpi helped in the response to the pandemic, as in the case of the dispersal of family nucleuses in small villages distant from one another. Another factor that contributed to social isolation was the food autonomy of most families who, in the better conserved regions of their territory, can produce all the food needed for their well-being. It is worth noting that in the last few decades, the traditional way of life had been impacted by public policies that lead to demographic concentration and sedentarization. Consequently, some families lacked sufficient food in their villages located further from the highway and needed to receive flour donations to be able to continue living in these locations in 2020 and the start of 2021. Nonetheless, they took advantage of this moment to clear many new swiddens and the prediction is that they will cease to need food aid from July when the new plantations can be harvested.

In the Oiapoque region a collective isolation strategy was established to avoid contact with people and/or products from outside Indigenous Lands. Although maintaining this isolation has been very difficult, some success was achieved in this endeavor. The strengthening of the traditional diet has also been recorded during this period of the pandemic, whether because of the lack of access to processed food or because of a critical reflection on the habit of consuming these products and the harm they cause to people’s health.

Finally, indigenous peoples and their complex modes of existence (among them, their deep knowledge and management of the ecosystems that they inhabit) are an obstacle to economic forces interested in transforming any natural resource into a commodity. Public policies that strengthen and protect the rights of these peoples – whether these are fomented by the State or by non-governmental organizations – are direct and efficacious instruments for combating the socioenvironmental degradation that affects the country and the planet as a whole.

**Conclusion –** To conclude, we ask the esteemed Special Rapporteur to recommend to the Brazilian government that it:

1. Consults indigenous peoples, through their organizations, before planning and implementing its COVID-19 response actions in Indigenous Lands.
2. Resumes, as a matter of urgency, the granting of the emergency aid to indigenous peoples, especially to those peoples living in more socially vulnerable situations, adapting these policies to local contexts.
3. Mobilizes sufficient resources for the monthly distribution of basic food packages during the pandemic to indigenous populations living in food insecurity.
4. Immediately removes intruders from Indigenous Lands and reinforces the actions of inspecting and monitoring by the relevant public agencies.
5. Includes in the National Vaccination Plan those indigenous peoples living in non-homologated lands, retaken lands, and urban contexts.
6. Makes publicly available qualified official data on COVID-19 cases and deaths among indigenous peoples, as well as on vaccine coverage.
7. Includes a plan for communicating accurate information and for combatting fake news in relation to COVID-19 for indigenous peoples.
8. Adopts measures for training Multidisciplinary Indigenous Healthcare Teams for these to be able to provide culturally appropriate healthcare, as established in Brazil’s indigenous healthcare legislation.
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