Based on a full review of your PhD proposal, here is a **committee-style grade assessment** followed by a **SWOT analysis**.

🎓 Committee Evaluation and Grade

Evaluation Criteria

Criterion	Evaluation
Clarity of Research Objectives	★★★★★ Clear, focused, and well-aligned with broader sustainability goals.
Significance and Originality	★★★★★ Highly original comparative approach with strong theoretical backing.
Methodological Rigor	★★★★☆ Technically advanced and feasible, though dependent on data availability and engagement levels.
Feasibility within Timeline	★★★★☆ Ambitious but well-structured timeline; risks exist in engagement or technical execution.
Engagement & Ethical Practice	★★★★★ Best-practice application of Indigenous Data Sovereignty and ethics.
Scholarly Foundations	★★★★★ Strong integration with comprehensive exams; clear academic lineage.
Impact & Knowledge Mobilization	★★★★☆ Very strong, especially through open-source tools; some risks in overpromising reach.

Final Committee Grade: **A / A+ (94%)**

This is a strong, well-written, and socially responsible proposal with academic, technical, and policy relevance. The only caveats are related to the heavy reliance on stakeholder engagement and technical infrastructure—which, while feasible, will require careful management.

SWOT Analysis

Strengths	Weaknesses
- Strong interdisciplinarity (policy + geospatial science + Indigenous governance).	- Complexity of tool development and computational workflows could lead to delays or tech debt.
- Grounded in three rigorous comprehensive exam papers.	- Case study success is partially contingent on levels of community engagement, which may vary.
- Clearly defined methodology with a tested, validated prototype.	- Potential overreliance on MapBiomas/Hansen datasets that may carry classification bias.

Strengths	Weaknesses
- Prioritizes Indigenous Data Sovereignty and community-led validation.	- Ethical and technical obligations can delay publication/dissemination if partner feedback is delayed.
- Highly replicable, open-source and cost-effective.	- High expectations for multi-stakeholder impact may face institutional resistance or policy inertia.

Opportunities	Threats
- Contributes to Canadian and Brazilian forest policy debates amid UNDRIP/Marco Temporal legal shifts.	- Political developments (e.g., rollbacks on Indigenous rights in either country) may limit uptake.
- Can support community-led monitoring, empowering Indigenous stewardship.	- Risk of disengagement or refusal by key communities due to extractive research fatigue.
- Potential to produce high-impact publications and international presentations.	- Technical limitations (resolution, accuracy) may be challenged by reviewers or partners.
- Methodological frameworks may be adopted by NGOs or international policy bodies (e.g., FAO, UN-REDD).	- Territorial legal disputes could constrain the ability to publish findings or maps.

Would you like feedback tailored for submission to ethics boards, funding agencies, or potential Indigenous collaborators? I can also help you craft a short abstract or policy brief from this proposal.