

Response to comments from the UK on the Brazil DGM Project:

1. The DGM Framework Operating Guidelines state that Government representation on the NSC can occur “as appropriate”. “The National Steering Committee (NSC) and the Global Steering Committee (GSC), are the main decision-making bodies. Both Committees are comprised primarily of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities as decision-making members. This is a defining feature of the DGM, where IPLCs have a key decision-making role in the program with active support from governments and MDB members.”

a. In the case of Brazil’s DGM, the Government of Brazil has requested full decision making powers on the NSC. Although this is supported by stakeholders, the UK would appreciate further information on the background to this request, along with details of which parts of Government will be represented on the committee.

b. We would also like to emphasise that NSC composition should be driven by IPLC representatives and could therefore differ from country to country. It therefore may not always be “appropriate” for Government representatives to have full decision making powers on all NSCs.

It is important to mention that the Brazil DGM would build, in part, on experiences gained and lessons learned over the last twenty-two years in the Brazilian Amazon, concerning environmental management and governance, indigenous lands, local communities, and natural resources management and stakeholder participation. During that process, the World Bank and the Government of Brazil developed strong partnerships with NGO's and Indigenous Associations, supporting projects for indigenous lands demarcation, surveillance and monitoring, natural resource management and capacity-building.

In this context, in all regional workshops and at the Integrative Seminar carried out during the joint preparation process, several factors have been considered by the key stakeholders for supporting the request of the Government of Brazil with regards to its participation in the NSC. It is worth emphasizing Brazil’s encompassing and strong regulatory framework related to Indigenous Peoples and Traditional Communities. Brazil has signed the main international treaties related to Indigenous Peoples rights and the country’s Federal Constitution acknowledges and supports the critical rights to self-determination and social diversity. Constitutionally, the Brazilian Government is entrusted to protect Indigenous Peoples lands and rights as well as to promote Indigenous Peoples livelihood and ethno-development. Brazilian legislation and policies have also recently acknowledged the rights of traditional communities and promoted the regularization of land tenure rights and promotion of their traditional livelihoods.

It is also important to register that according to Brazilian Law, Indigenous Peoples lands are state owned lands, which Indigenous Peoples have perpetual rights of use and the Federal Government is fully responsible for protecting these lands and rights. All activities related with these lands have to be authorized by the Federal Government. Most of the lands used by other traditional communities for preserving their traditional livelihoods – such as extractive reserves, open communal lands, etc. – are also owned and/or granted by the Government.

The participation of Governmental representatives at the NSC is also conceived as a pre-requisite to enhance DGM's capacity to achieve some positive outcomes. Thus, the participation of Governmental representatives in the NSC might: (i) lend greater legitimacy to the Project within the country; (ii) bring to the deliberative processes and dialogues, the Government's convening power and overarching view of the issues and country policies; (iii) add critical analytical capacity with regards to technical soundness, operational feasibility and alignment of proposals with national policies; (iv) scale up the potential for replicability and for transformative impacts of the supported interventions as the Government might take the lessons learned and the successful experiences pilot-tested by the DGM and incorporate them in other Governmental programs and policies; (v) promote an enabling environment in which increased engagement and participation, role and voice, of IPTCs in REDD+/climate-change decision-making bodies at the local and national levels will take place during and after Project's implementation; and, (vi) expand the social networks and strengthen the social capital of IPTC representative organizations insofar as the dialogues, knowledge and experience exchanges promoted by the DGM will not only bond together representatives of the same stakeholder groups reinforcing horizontal ties, but will also bridge and link different stakeholders reinforcing vertical ties.

At the last seminar of the joint preparation process, it was agreed that the three governmental members at the NSC would be: (i) one representative appointed by the Ministry of Environment, which has developed a long-lasting work with traditional communities; (ii) one representative appointed by the Fundação Nacional do Índio (FUNAI – Indigenous Peoples National Foundation); and (iii) one representative appointed by the Brazil Investment Plan Executive Committee.

2. How will the participation of the most marginalised groups on the NSC be assured?

The NSC agreed composition assures the participation of self-selected representatives of Indigenous Peoples and Traditional Communities as requested by the DGM Framework Operating Guidelines.

In the Cerrado Biome, Indigenous Peoples and Traditional Communities have been organized in community associations, regional organizations and civilian society networks for more than twenty years. These organizations/networks have been incorporated and legitimized as part of IPTCs' political organization and ways to deal with the encompassing national society and Government. They have been strongly representing and advocating IPTC interests in different consultative and deliberative multi-stakeholder arenas for many years. They count with broad social legitimacy among their constituency, which also encompasses the most marginalized groups.

Essentially, the proposed NSC composition relies on and takes advantage of the historical and ongoing processes of social capital formation (bonding, linking and bridging relationships that have strengthened and expanded horizontal and vertical collaborative ties amongst Indigenous Peoples, Traditional Communities, Governmental Agencies, NGOs, and other actors), political representation and advocacy that have been championed in the Cerrado Biome (as elsewhere in Brazil) by IPTCs themselves.

This ensures that the NSC will not be just an arena created for responding to the demands of a particular intervention without roots in the historical and social processes through which IPTC have sought to empower themselves and to voice the interests and views of the least and the most marginalized groups among themselves.

Thus, for the first composition of the NSC (drawn from the consultation process carried out during project preparation), the key stakeholders have chosen entities that (i) represent diverse groups, (ii) have a strong record of “social accountability”, and (iii) broad experience on dealing with state agencies and other social actors.

Component 2 will support activities to outreach, build capacity and engage the most marginalized groups increasing their skills and qualification to be part in broader dialogues on the issues at hand and Component 1 will prioritize through one of its windows grants to the most vulnerable and marginalized groups. In other words, the whole DGM process might contribute to leveling the playing field and to increase engagement of the most vulnerable and marginalized.

3. Grant size ceilings for each window are proposed. Limits on grant size might exclude some promising and strategic interventions. How flexible is this if a good case is made? How will the NEA and NSC avoid an “ad hoc” scattering of small projects and ensure that interventions maximise synergies where appropriate.

Thanks for the underlying suggestion of rendering the grant size ceilings more flexible. During the last stages of project preparation the possibility of making the grant size ceilings flexible and the circumstances for doing so will be discussed with IPTCs.

It is worth considering, however, that, throughout the joint preparation process for this project till now, the idea of targeting DGM interventions in larger and most strategic interventions has been proposed by a representative of Indigenous Peoples and Traditional Communities. This proposal would mean that fewer interventions would be made. The proposal was, however, rejected by the overwhelming majority of IPTCs themselves. The prevailing position favored the DGM focuses on small projects and, consequently, is able to reach a larger number of communities that need some investments to overcome the pressures they face, to keep and/or re-establish their low-footprint livelihoods, and to strengthen their sustainable coping strategies. This approach is not necessarily opposed or in contradiction with providing support to promising interventions and maximizing synergies where this is appropriate. The NRM window is, indeed, envisaged to pursue such aims.

Furthermore, the project is designed to emphasize both the flexibility in planning and the NSC decision-making power. Thus, when drawing the calls for proposals for each window, as well as when assessing proposals submitted in response to the call for proposals issued for each window, the NSC may give priority to interventions that are the most promising (innovation is a key criteria considered for proposal selection), or the most able to maximize synergies with other DGM interventions, or with interventions supported by other sources. In such case, these criteria will be broadly disseminated as part of the Call for Proposals.

4. Given the DGM Brazil’s stated objective to *strengthen the engagement of the Brazilian Cerrado biome’s indigenous people and traditional communities in FIP, REDD+ with a view to*

improving livelihoods, land use and sustainable forest management in their territories, the results framework does not adequately test the underlying assumption that improved capacity to engage correlates to improved forest management and sustainable land use practices. This could be made more explicit.

The stated objective of DGM Brazil is: “...*(i) strengthen the engagement of Brazilian Cerrado biome`s indigenous peoples and traditional communities in FIP, REDD+ and similar climate change oriented programs at the local, national and global level, as well as to (ii) contribute towards improving livelihoods, land use and sustainable forest management in their territories.*” However, the team considers very important to revise the Results Framework to render more explicit how improved capacity to engage and improved forest management and sustainable land use practices will be combined to reach the objectives of the Project. The underlying assumption is that improved forest management and sustainable land use practices will result from both (i) engagement in regional, national and international networks for exchanging knowledge on these topics, and (ii) the local community interventions for improving livelihoods through land use and sustainable forest management in IPTC`s territories. Combining access to knowledge with access to resources to implement sustainable forest and land use management practices – which simultaneously have a positive impact on livelihoods and living conditions – are expected to make a contribution for IPTCs so they continue to provide the relevant environmental services they do for the large area of the Cerrado biome that is under their control.