Since day one of the pandemic, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) has made significant efforts to understand the behaviour of COVID-19 and monitor its effects in the region. Having reliable and updated information allows FAO to design actions – relevant to the reality of each country – that help to address the crisis better.

The publication and dissemination of these bulletins – sixteen to date, counting this edition – is part of FAO’s contributions. They have addressed the impacts of COVID-19 on food systems in Latin America and the Caribbean in a multidimensional way.

This edition provides a summary of the impact that COVID-19 has had in the region and the responses implemented by the countries to mitigate the effects of the crisis.

There is no doubt that assessing the responses put in place by countries to slow the progress of the pandemic helps to plan better future actions. That is the purpose of these bulletins; we hope that they help to do so.
2. Key messages

- To date, the region has recorded declines in indicators, such as a 6.4 percent drop in GDP, a 8.6 percent drop in trade, and a 9.5 percent drop in employment, reflecting one of the largest economic crises of the century.

- In this negative scenario, the food system has become more resilient, especially in terms of international food trade, which has even grown during the pandemic by 8.3 percent. This growth is possibly due to demand from the main destinations – the United States of America, the European Union and China – which has not changed significantly.

- However, in the social sphere, in addition to the drastic reduction in employment and consequent fall in household income, food prices rose. The regional Consumer Price Index (CPI) for food has increased by 5.6 percent so far this year (1.8 points more than the overall CPI), which directly affects the accessibility and quality of food in households.

- To date, countries have concentrated their efforts on implementing measures that seek to mitigate the economic impact of the pandemic.

- By focusing on measures related to the food system, priority has also been given to those that seek to support, stimulate and strengthen production, processing and distribution in the sector.

- On the other hand, to date, measures related to social protection and employment have lagged behind, at least in number.

- Still, the crisis has brought some good practices that should be maintained over time, such as greater public-private coordination and collaboration between countries at the regional level to tackle the crisis.

- The pandemic has accelerated the use of technologies for the dissemination of knowledge (webinars) and the commercialisation of products (online trade), the latter being critical in shortening marketing chains.
3. Main impacts

The main effects that the COVID-19 crisis has had on the food system are analysed below. Although the indicators presented are not comparable, as not all countries have the same information, they do allow to discern trends and reach some general conclusions.

Available evidence indicates that the food system has been able to overcome the crisis better than other economic sectors, showing greater resilience to the pandemic.

3.1. Impact of the crisis on growth in the food system

The evolution of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) during this year is clear: the economies of the region decreased during the first half of 2020 compared to the same period in 2019.

The drop in the countries’ growth is due to two factors:

i. the strong restrictions applied to national services and tourism sectors (FAO and ECLAC, 2020a); and

ii. the decline in exports from the manufacturing, mining and fuel industries (FAO and ECLAC, 2020b).

When analysing GDP, we can see that it has contracted in all the countries with available data; at the regional level the fall is 6.4 percent.

The food system, however, has shown a reduction so far this year of less than 5.1 percent of GDP. It is therefore possible to speculate that this sector is somewhat more resilient to the effects of the crisis than the other economic sectors.¹

Figure 1/ Variation in the food sector’s GDP versus the rest of the sectors, first half of 2020 versus the same period in 2019 (%), by subregion*.
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* The countries considered for South America are: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Peru, and Uruguay. Central America: Mexico. The Caribbean: Belize.

Source: ECLAC, based on official information from each country.

¹In South America, the food sectors of Brazil, Colombia and Peru show positive variations during the year. The same is true in Central America, dragged down by Mexico’s numbers.
3.2. Impact of the crisis on food sector exports

The pandemic has negatively impacted the export of regional products. Overall, the value of exported products has fallen by 8.6 percent in 2020 compared to the same period in 2019.

The food sector seems to be in a better position: the value of exported products has grown by 8.3 percent at the regional level, which represents a clear difference with the other products marketed by the region. There are two factors which may explain this behaviour:

i. food is a basic necessity; and

ii. demand from the main destinations – the United States of America, the European Union and China – has not changed significantly (FAO and ECLAC, 2020b).

The countries analysed in South America and the Caribbean recorded an increase in trade of goods from the food sector. In contrast, the rest of the sectors recorded a fall in the value of their exports of 16.6 and 11.5 percent, respectively. Although the marketing of agricultural products has fallen in Central America, the decrease has been far less important than other exports. However, in the food sector, the crisis has significantly affected some subsectors, such as the export of live animals, fruit, vegetables, and fish and seafood (FAO and ECLAC, 2020b).

Figure 2/ Change in the value of exports, January and August 2020 versus the same period in 2019 (%), by subregion*

* The countries considered for South America are: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Paraguay, Peru, and Uruguay. In Central America: Costa Rica, El Salvador and Mexico. In the Caribbean: Barbados, Belize, Jamaica and Puerto Rico.
** Data until July for Argentina, Belize, Colombia, Mexico, and Peru. For Jamaica, data until May.
*** "Agriculture" corresponds to Chapters 1 to 23 of the Harmonised System.

Source: FAO, based on official information from national sources (customs, central banks and statistical institutes).
3.3. Impact of the crisis on employment in the food sector

Employment has declined significantly in the region (-9.5 percent) compared to the same period last year. The most affected have been those working in the informal economy – prevalent in Latin America and the Caribbean – mainly composed of women, young people, indigenous people and migrants (FAO and ECLAC, 2020a).

Unlike other sectors, such as services and trade, employment in the food sector has not been so affected, falling by 5.5 percent. However, we must be cautious and not draw hasty conclusions from this data, since unemployment in fishing and aquaculture has increased (FAO and ECLAC, 2020a).

Values at the sub-regional level show a similar trend (see Figure 3).2

3.4. Impact of the crisis on the price level

Unlike other indicators, the Consumer Price Index (CPI) has had a more significant impact on food than on the other products of the basic basket.

Feeding during the pandemic has cost more than in the same period last year. At the regional level, the food CPI has changed by 5.6 percent, while the total CPI has changed by 3.8 percent. The Caribbean subregion has seen the highest increases so far this year compared with the same period last year.

It should be noted that “employment” is not a strictly comparable indicator between countries, although the figures in Figure 3 represent average changes versus the same period in the previous year. Besides, because of the pandemic, employment data may experience measurement problems or methodological changes in surveys.
Figure 4/ Change in the food and beverage CPI and total between January and August 2020 compared to the same period in 2019 (%), by subregion*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>CPI for food</th>
<th>Total CPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central America**</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Caribbean**</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The countries considered for South America are: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru, and Uruguay. In Central America: Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Mexico and Nicaragua. In the Caribbean: Aruba, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines.

** Data until May for Aruba, Guyana, Haiti, St. Vincent and the Grenadines. Data until June for Nicaragua.

Note: There could be measurement problems or methodological changes in surveys due to the pandemic, so imputation methodologies are used which may introduce measurement distortions.

Source: FAO, based on ECLAC (2020a).

A survey of the region’s main wholesale markets would confirm these findings (FAO and FLAMA, 2020). The survey highlights that, although market prices have remained stable, there is an upward trend in some products, mainly meat and fish, which would affect household access to quality food.
4. Policies implemented

4.1. Analysis of policies implemented at the national level

All actions implemented at the national level to date to address the pandemic were analysed. These actions have been classified by ECLAC (2020b) as: travel restrictions, economy, education, employment, gender, social protection, and health. However, some national actions have probably not been incorporated yet into the platform.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel restrictions</td>
<td>• Entry restrictions or bans for foreign travellers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Closure and border controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Restrictions and closures of public places and mass meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>• Fiscal, monetary and corporate policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Restrictions on economic activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Price and quantity controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Economic incentive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Regulation of the hygiene market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Debt relief and suspension of credit payments (individuals and micro-entrepreneurs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and schools</td>
<td>• Suspension of classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provision of tools to develop distance learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintain school feeding programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>• Employment protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Elective work permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduction of working hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prohibition of dismissal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>• Measures to control violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Care economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Generation of employment and income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Benefits, transfers and other social protection measures and digital acceleration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social protection</td>
<td>• Transfer of cash, food and goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Service guarantee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>• Health emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Compulsory coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mandatory general quarantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Coverage and extension of screening tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adaptation of hospitals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FAO, based on ECLAC (2020b).
A first analysis indicates that the measures have been implemented mainly in the **economic field**, followed by the **health field** by far. This shows what the main concerns of the countries in the region have been at this stage of the crisis. The Caribbean stands out, where, in addition to the measures mentioned, policies related to movement restriction have been implemented with a similar intensity (see Figure 5).

**Figure 5/ Number of policies implemented, by sub-region.**

![Diagram showing number of policies implemented, by sub-region](image)

Source: FAO, based on ECLAC (2020b).

The countries’ response is likely to be related to the stage of the crisis. The **transition phase** goes from the beginning of physical distancing measures to the planning of their dismantling. The next phase, **economic recovery**, will take place when the pandemic is considered over. This phase, which has not yet begun, could last for years (FAO and ECLAC, 2020c).

The crisis has hit the informal sector particularly hard. This sector has a high percentage of women, young people, immigrants and indigenous people, as previous publications in this series have highlighted (FAO and ECLAC, 2020a). However, measures related to social protection, gender and employment have not been the most popular.
During the transition phase, the decisions a country takes to contain the virus must go hand in hand with economic policies that try to mitigate the economic and social consequences of the decline in activity. These measures should seek to avoid a breakdown in the productive fabric and prevent a major financial crisis. In the transition phase, efforts should be made to ensure that the GDP of the region’s countries falls as little as possible (IADB, 2020).

Governments must therefore do everything possible to support businesses to stay afloat. This is especially relevant for micro, small and medium-sized enterprises in the region, which account for two-thirds of all jobs. Compensatory policies implemented by governments should seek to cushion losses and increase liquidity in this sector, through programmes of cash transfers and soft loans to both consumers and businesses (FAO and ECLAC, 2020c).

However, the analysis gives the impression that in the countries of the region, measures have focused on the economic revival of enterprises rather than on the economic and social protection of people.
4.2. Analysis of policies related to food systems at the national level

FAO classified policies related to the agrifood sector and food security. The institutions involved in this type of measure were mainly ministries of agriculture, livestock and fisheries, and of rural and social development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rapid assessment</strong></td>
<td>• Impact assessment measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Quantification of damages and losses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trade</strong></td>
<td>• Incentive for state and private purchases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• E-commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pricing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Coordination between countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food</strong></td>
<td>• School feeding programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Food basket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Food security counselling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production</strong></td>
<td>• Increased water resource efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Delivery of inputs, support to artisanal fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Delivery of credits and bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Payment for environmental and ecosystem services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poverty/employment</strong></td>
<td>• Training for economic recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Social protection to ensure delivery of basic supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bank transfers to the most vulnerable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FAO, based on an internal survey of the FAO Regional Office.

The analysis of these measures shows that the main focus has been on supporting and strengthening the production of food systems, even though it has not been the sector most affected by the crisis.

The second most important measures are related to food, poverty and employment, which could be associated to social protection measures. Here, in relation to the previous point, the measures that seek to protect people do become relevant. Probably because the analysis has focused on the ministries of rural and social development, which is where the vast majority of these measures are developed and implemented.
Figure 7/ Number of food system policies by sub-region.
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Source: FAO, based on an internal survey of the FAO Regional Office.
Outstanding measures in the region during the pandemic

The COVID-19 crisis can also be understood as an opportunity to improve production systems and how the public and private sectors relate to each other in order to establish a more resilient and sustainable system.

This section highlights some of the measures implemented in the context of the crisis that have proved to be very good practices or initiatives. Some are likely to last beyond the crisis; for others, even though they were implemented in a temporary situation, efforts should be made to ensure that they persist over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public-private articulation in wholesale market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faced with the threat of closure of food outlets – because they are considered places of high exposure to the virus, wholesale markets decided to implement mitigation measures that would allow the protection of workers and consumers. Thus, a dozen markets have initiated a fruitful dialogue among themselves and with the authorities to share health practices and protocols.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More regional communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As trade in food products is fundamental to the economy of Latin American and Caribbean countries, communication and coordination between countries has been crucial to ensure a smooth exchange of goods. In this sense, the Hemispheric Summits (Cumbres Hemisféricas) have been a milestone in coordination. In these summits, governments have managed to ensure measures to facilitate international and interregional food trade, making food supply viable. The ministries of agriculture have played a fundamental role in this type of initiative.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of technologies for knowledge dissemination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The pandemic has forced national, international and academic organisations to answer the questions that were raised during the crisis. Physical distance and travel restrictions forced an acceleration in the use of communication technologies that were not as popular, such as video conferencing and webinars. The FAO Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean alone has developed over 20 webinars, bringing together a multitude of experts from various disciplines to exchange ideas and experiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of technologies to shorten the marketing chain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The importance of shortening the marketing chain to improve the conditions of producers has always been advocated. Restrictive measures have forced producers to market their products through online trading tools, where social networks such as Instagram and Whatsapp have proved to be very accessible and efficient partners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In June, ECLAC and FAO stated that the main challenge was to "prevent the health crisis from becoming a food crisis." A hundred days later, can we say that we have achieved it in the region? How are we doing and what remains to be done?

The challenge remains. We do not know when the health impacts of the pandemic will reach their maximum, and as long as there is a health risk, there is an economic risk. The policies against hunger implemented by governments and civil society have helped. Still, it is critical to implement them where they are needed and to maintain them where they have been implemented. It is too early to claim victory. The agricultural sector and the food system depend on long chains and long production processes. Therefore, although the primary effects of the pandemic have begun to diminish in some areas of the region, its final results in the primary stages of the food system are outdated. There are still many risks in the system and, therefore, this emergency must continue to be monitored closely.

Before the pandemic, the main challenge for agriculture worldwide was to increase food production by 50 percent over the next 30 years, and do so in a sustainable and fair manner. Now, to this challenge, we are adding recovery from the century’s biggest crisis. Are there competing responses to both situations? Should we choose one or prioritise the other?

The response to the pandemic must be aligned with responses to other long-term issues such as global change and climate change. We need a systemic and integrative approach. The pandemic has highlighted the many and varied relationships between society and the natural world. Therefore, it is crucial to think about recovery as an opportunity to make transformations, which in the case of the rural world implies implementing a transition towards a more sustainable and inclusive agriculture. To minimise the negative externalities resulting from agricultural production, a transition towards a more ecological agriculture – which imitates nature as much as possible – must be promoted, ensuring that agricultural production meets the nutritional needs of all.

What are ECLAC’s latest economic projections for the region? What will be their main impacts on the food system?

We project a regional fall of around 9.1 percent in GDP in 2020. The value of exports will fall by 23 percent, driven by drops in both prices and volumes of around 12 percent. The number of unemployed will reach over 44 million by the end of 2020, 26 million more than in 2019. The number of people living in poverty will increase by 45 million, reaching 231 million this year, namely, 37 percent of the regional population. Similarly, the number of people living in extreme poverty will increase by 29 million, to reach 96 million in 2020. We know that these people are at risk of malnutrition and hunger.

However, the effect on the agricultural sector would be somewhat less. When looking at the countries that have reported GDP figures by sector up to the second quarter, it appears that all of them show a growth rate in agriculture higher than their overall growth rate. Three of them (Brazil, Colombia and Peru) show a
positive growth rate in the agricultural sector. The same applies to the labour market and exports. But the resilience of the sector does not imply that the effects of the pandemic will not be severe. The food system is resilient because it is essential. Therefore, even a minor effect can have a major impact.

**The food system has close links with other areas. What side effects the consequences of the pandemic have on the food system, and how can they be dealt with?**

The priority remains the same: prevent hunger from being a consequence of the pandemic. That is why we proposed the Bonus Against Hunger in June. Similarly, producers need to continue to operate their production systems normally. This is why we proposed extending the provision of soft credit and the provision of a basic investment kit to maintain the flows of inputs and products needed for agricultural production. These measures have been applied in a heterogeneous manner by countries, depending on their social and economic reality.

More than six months after the start of the crisis, the impacts on the sector are heterogeneous. Fishing has been one of the most affected sub-sectors. Restaurants and their workers have also been greatly impacted. Large companies, through technology, have been able to adjust their sales strategies to the needs of the pandemic. Some small and medium enterprises and small producers have also been able to move forward in this area, although most of them have not had this opportunity and are lagging behind.

Rapid action is needed to prevent a K-shaped recovery from the pandemic (a rapid recovery for some sectors and individuals and the opposite for most). To this end, access to digital technology must be universal in order to address the effects of COVID-19 better. This is one of the positive consequences of the crisis, which will hopefully serve the rapid and transformative recovery we all yearn for. We must continue to work together – governments, civil society, multilateral agencies – to achieve that goal.
After almost nine months since the COVID-19 crisis began, what would be the main lessons we should consider as a society?

There are several lessons. First, we can see that we learnt from the food crisis of 2007 and 2008, where strong protectionist measures were taken that exacerbated the rise in food prices. This time, global supply chains have normally been functioning, and there was very good coordination of governments together with the support of international organisations such as FAO and the World Trade Organization (WTO).

Secondly, we have discovered the main vulnerabilities of our food system. Two of them stand out: the lack of resilience and social inclusion in certain links of the value chain. Concerning the lack of resilience, we have seen problems of overcrowding in large distribution centres such as wholesale markets, fairs, and local markets, which have become sources of contagion. We have also seen problems with school feeding, considering that the vast majority of educational establishments throughout the region have had to close their doors, risking the feeding of 84 million children who eat at school. We have also seen outbreaks of contagion in some agro-industries, and problems with crew rotation in shipping, which is absolutely vital for food supplies.

On the other hand, we have become aware of our dependence on the 18 million agricultural producers and fishers in our region, since they are the ones who allow us to feed ourselves every day, as well as several million workers in the transport and distribution sector, and markets. Eighty percent of them work informally without social protection, health insurance and access to a pension. We see how an activity as vital as food rests on so much informality and, often, social exclusion.

This pandemic has allowed us to reconsider priorities. The positive side is that we can count on a basis for dialogue as well as the willingness of states and also international bodies to collaborate, to build solutions and alternatives to meet all these challenges.

From the perspective of disaster management, what stage are we in now as a region? Are we still in an emergency or have we already overcome it?

We really cannot consider our region or the whole world to be over the emergency as long as the pandemic is not controlled through a vaccine and medical treatments for those who get sick. The truth is that today, in the world, around 290 000 people are infected daily on average, and as long as these figures persist, we will continue to be in crisis. However, we can say that basic measures have now been put in place to ensure food supplies, which was an important initial fear.

It is now time to focus on three aspects: first and foremost, before the pandemic we had 67.5 million people in extreme poverty and probably going hungry. The Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) projects that the number of people in extreme poverty could reach 96.2 million in our region, meaning an increase of 28.5 million people. As incomes have fallen and millions have lost their jobs, the second aspect is that it is highly likely that many families will be forced to switch to much cheaper diets of lower nutritional quality and therefore less healthy; namely, diets high in sodium, sugars, saturated fats, calories, etc. This is relevant, as it could aggravate the epidemic of overweight and obesity in our region, a pre-existing condition that increases the risk for people who get COVID-19. Thirdly and finally, we must focus
on recovery. How can agriculture and food contribute to economic and social recovery? This question poses a huge task. The International Labour Organization (ILO) has just reported that 34 million people have lost their jobs in the region, so recovering sources of employment is paramount. In this task, agriculture and food have a key role to play. Agriculture alone contributes about 5 percent of the region’s GDP if we consider the entire food chain, including primary production, services, manufacturing, etc. The contribution to regional employment is about 24 percent, which could be a great source of recovery.

Thinking about the future, when we talk about recovery with transformation, what specifically needs to be transformed in the agrifood production we know so far?

In my opinion, when we talk about recovery with transformation, we are referring to three main areas of action. First, resilience in the food system, that is, being able to prevent and recover from disasters and crises in a timely, efficient and sustainable manner, including protecting, restoring and improving the food system from threats. Secondly, social inclusion in the food system by enabling all members of society to have access to nutritious, healthy and sufficient food. Also, ensure that family farming and rural small and medium enterprises have opportunities to participate and develop in the various markets that are part of the food system. Finally, restore the balance between food and the conservation of biodiversity and ecosystems. The loss of these balances is at the origin of this pandemic and previous ones such as SARS, avian influenza, Ebola and MERS. In fact, 60 percent of human diseases have an animal origin and 75 percent of new infectious diseases have this origin. If we do not restore basic ecological balances in agriculture and food, we will be regularly hit by these zoonoses.

What will be the main FAO streams in 2021?

FAO will have its Regional Conference from 19-21 October this year, and it will be up to the Member Nations to set and approve our priorities for the 2020-2021 biennium. We have submitted three major emphases to their consideration: the transformation of food systems to provide healthy diets for all and to meet the nutrition requirements of a growing population with new consumption patterns, while ensuring health for people and the planet, representing an opportunity for agriculture, fisheries and forestry to move towards new forms of sustainable production. Hand-in-hand, to achieve prosperous and inclusive rural societies, which will enable us to reduce poverty and hunger and alleviate the ethnic, economic, social, territorial and gender inequalities that still characterise the region’s rural societies. Finally, a sustainable and climate-resilient agriculture that helps mitigate water scarcity, pollution, soil degradation, loss of biodiversity, declining fish stocks and forest cover as well as the high levels of greenhouse gas emissions, which are a major cause of climate change. Besides, two cross-cutting emphases have been proposed: technological innovation and digitalisation of agriculture and food. The second one aims at strengthening partnerships and collaborative work with the private sector, civil society and the scientific and academic world.
6. Resources

This section provides sources that may be useful to delve into the topics covered in this issue.

**ECLAC**
COVID-19 Observatory in Latin America and the Caribbean. Economic and social impact
https://www.cepal.org/en/topics/covid-19

ECLAC’s COVID-19 Observatory presents a series of reports on the impacts of the pandemic on various social and economic aspects and a compilation of the policies implemented by countries during the pandemic.

**World Bank**
Map of SME-Support Measures in Response to COVID-19

Map with information on the initiatives carried out by the countries to support small and medium enterprises to overcome this period of low activity.

**IADB**

Inter-American Development Bank report detailing policies to mitigate this crisis.

**IICA**
Policy measures and actions of the agrifood sector in relation to COVID-19

This blog presents (and regularly updates) the measures that countries are taking to mitigate the effects of COVID-19 on the agrifood sector, and to accelerate the recovery and continuity of the sector’s activity.

**Resources**

This section provides sources that may be useful to delve into the topics covered in this issue.
ECCB
Eastern Caribbean Central Bank. Dashboard
https://www.eccb-centralbank.org/statistics/dashboard-datas/

Dashboard illustrating the state of economic activity in some Caribbean countries.

---

FAO
FAO-FLAMA Bulletins - Wholesale markets: Action against COVID-19

Published by the FAO Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean and the Latin American Federation of Supply Markets (FLAMA) which provide statistics and the main actions implemented by the region’s wholesale markets to ensure their operations during the pandemic.

---

OECD
Key policy responses from the OECD

Data collection, analysis and recommendations to address the health, economic and social crisis, facilitate coordination and contribute to global action.

---

FAO
The food system and the challenges of COVID-19 series

A contribution of public and private supply establishments to food access and the functioning of the food system in Latin America and the Caribbean.
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