

June 8, 2014

## **Approval by Mail: Dedicated Grant Mechanism for Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (Brazil, Global)**

Dear Patricia

The FIP Programme Sub Committee approved FIP funding for the DGM Global Component and Brazil Project on the 28<sup>th</sup> June. The decision included a request that the World Bank takes into account comments made at the meeting and written comments submitted by Sub-Committee members by July 15, 2014, in the implementation of the projects.

The UK welcomes progress on this important component of the FIP and acknowledges the highly consultative process followed, and the complexity and ambition of the DGM, at national and “global” component level. We would like to submit the following comments for consideration during implementation and, where relevant, as other national components go through the design process

### *Global Component:*

1. Clarity is needed on what the DGM Global Component can and cannot pay for in terms of non-FIP country Indigenous People and Local Community (IPLC) participation.
2. The Global Executing Agency (GEA) is already selected (Conservation International). The Global Steering Committee (GSC), which oversees what the GEA does, will be selected from representatives that make up the National Steering Committees (NSC). Since the NSCs are a long way off being finalised in each country, what are the interim arrangements until such time as NCS members are selected and their representatives to the GCS chosen? Will there be a continuing role for the transitional committee?
3. One of the risks in the programme document is elite capture. Since a “democratic” process is to be pursued in selecting members for the national steering committees, this might not help to get traditionally marginalised groups represented. Will affirmative action or other approaches be employed to ensure that particularly marginalised/voiceless groups get representation?
4. On the results framework, the UK would like to see more explicit language in the 2<sup>nd</sup> common indicator (The % of participants in the capacity development activities with increased role and voice in FIP or other REDD+ programmes at local, national or global levels) This should gather data not only on gender. Given that there are concerns about elite capture, it would be good to also differentiate between particularly marginalised or traditionally excluded groups.

### *Brazil DGM:*

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.

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

Very many thanks for the opportunity to comment  
With best wishes  
Gaia

Gaia Allison  
Forests and Land Use Adviser  
Climate and Environment Department  
DFID  
Abercrombie House  
Eaglesham Road  
East Kilbride  
Glasgow G75 8EA  
+44 (0) 1355 84 3903