

# VALIDATION REPORT FOR THE PROJECT LACANDÓN-FOREST FOR LIFE REDD+ PROJECT

**AENOR** Asociación Española de  
Normalización y Certificación

AENOR  
6 Génova. 28004 Madrid – España  
[www.aenor.es](http://www.aenor.es)

<b>Project Title</b>	Lacandón- Forest for Life REDD+ Project
<b>Version</b>	1
<b>Report ID</b>	Val CCB Report Lacandon 20160618

<b>Report Title</b>	CCB Validation Report Lacandón project
<b>Client</b>	Souh Pole Group
<b>Pages</b>	63
<b>Date of Issue</b>	2016-06-18
<b>Prepared By</b>	AENOR
<b>Contact</b>	Génova 6. 28004 Madrid-España. Teléfono +34 914326000, <a href="http://www.aenor.es">www.aenor.es</a>
<b>Approved By</b>	Luis Robles Olmos
<b>Work Carried Out By</b>	Lead Auditor: José Luis Fuentes Auditor: Manuel García Rosell

**Summary:**

AENOR started the CCB validation few days before the PDD was public in the CCB webpage on April 1 2016.

The field visit took place on February 8-12, 2016 in which the auditors visited the project area, interviewed key stakeholders, staff and other related experts, and also reviewed the PD, and supporting documents. The scope of the validation was to assess the conformance of information in the PDD with the CCB.

This validation report has been submitted to the primary PP in which 9 CARs and 7 CLs were reported for CCB. However, all these issues raised during the validation process were appropriately closed by means of corrections, more clear explanations and other supported documents. A list of evidence provided by PPs is furnished in section 5 of this report.

Hence, once all issued detected were appropriately solved, AENOR carried out a final validation report and deems with reasonable level of assurance that the project complies with all of the validation criteria for CCB.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... 3

1 INTRODUCTION ..... 5

    1.1 Objective ..... 5

    1.2 Scope and Criteria ..... 5

    1.3 Description of the project ..... 5

    1.4 Summary of validation Results..... 6

2 METHODOLOGY..... 7

    2.1 CCBA Standard..... 7

    2.2 Validation Team ..... 7

    2.3 Validation process..... 7

3 STAKEHOLDERS COMMENTS..... 8

    3.1 General Section ..... 8

        3.1.1 G1. Project Goals, Design and Long-term Viability..... 8

        3.1.2 G2. Without-project Land Use Scenario and Additionality ..... 15

        3.1.3 G3. Stakeholder Engagement..... 16

        3.1.4 G4. Management Capacity. .... 24

        3.1.5 G5. Legal Status and property rights. .... 25

    3.2 Climate Section ..... 30

        3.2.1 CL1 Without project Climate Section ..... 30

        3.2.2 CL2 Net Positive Climate Impacts..... 31

        3.2.3 CL3 Offsite Climate Impacts. .... 32

3.2.4	CL4 Climate Impact Monitoring.....	33
3.2.5	GL 1 Climate Change Adaptation Benefits. Optional Criterion .....	34
3.3	Community Section .....	35
3.3.1	CM1 Without Project Community Scenario.....	35
3.3.2	CM2 Net Positive Community Impacts.....	37
3.3.3	CM3 Other Stakeholders Impacts .....	38
3.3.4	CM4 Community Impact Monitoring.....	38
3.3.5	GL2 Exceptional Community Benefits. Optional Criterion .....	40
3.4	Biodiversity Section .....	44
3.4.1	B.1 Biodiversity Without Project Scenario.....	44
3.4.2	B2. Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts.....	45
3.4.3	B3 Offsite Biodiversity Impacts. ....	48
3.4.4	B4 Biodiversity Impact Monitoring .....	49
3.4.5	GL3 Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits. Optional Criterion .....	50
4	VALIDATION CONCLUSION .....	54
5	ANEXX 1: LIST OF EVIDENCE PROVIDED.....	55

## 1 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Objective

The objective of the validation was to conduct an independent evaluation of the project against all the criteria defined by the CCB standard. As a result of the validation, AENOR will conclude if the project activity meets the requirements of the third edition of the CCB Standard and whether the project must be submitted for registration with CCBA.

### 1.2 Scope and Criteria

The Project was validated against the CCB Standard third edition to determine if CCB requirements are fulfilled by the project. Any discrepancy real or potential identified during the evaluation process was resolved by issuing the following results:

The types of results issued by AENOR were characterized as follows:

Clarification (CL) occurs if the information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether they complied with the applicable requirements of CCB.

Non Conformity (NC). NC is issued where a significant discrepancy is detected with respect to a specific requirement. This kind of result can only be closed upon receipt by AENOR of evidence indicating that the identified discrepancy has been corrected.

A forward action request is raised during validation to highlight issues related to project implementation that require review during the first verification of the project activity.

### 1.3 Description of the project

The Lacandon - Forests for Life REDD+ Project focuses on reducing deforestation, improving the living conditions of the communities located within the National Park Sierra del Lacandón and surroundings.

By reducing deforestation, environmental function of the various ecosystems will continue, cultural and archaeological heritage is preserved and the emission of greenhouse gases from deforestation and degradation is avoided.

The Sierra del Lacandón National Park is one of the seven nucleuses of the Mayan Biosphere Reserve (MBR) which represents almost 20% of the surface of Guatemala and about 60% of the surface inside the Guatemala System of Natural Protected Areas.

The project zone is included in the Key Biodiversity Area (KBA) Selva Maya Corridor, which contains the second most extensive tract of continuous tropical rainforest in the Americas after the Amazon Forest, where Selva Lacandóna and Sierra del Lacandón (Mexico/Guatemala) are one of the four keys biodiversity areas.

#### 1.4 Summary of validation Results

This report discusses the findings of validation for sections and indicators of CCB. For each Criterion, the CCB indicators are listed along with a description of the evidence to be checked, and referred to the findings of the audit where appropriate. A complete list of records and reports/studies used by PPs to support explanations and justification for each indicator of the CCB Standard is included in section 5.

These results can include non-conformities, clarifications and forward actions. To carry out this final validation report all matters have to be closed. A summary of the results is shown:

	Criterion	Required/Optional	Fulfilment Y/N, N/A
G1	Project Goals, Design and Long Term Viability	Required	Yes
G2	Without Project Land Use Scenario and Additionality	Required	Yes
G3	Stakeholder Engagement	Required	Yes
G4	Management Capacity	Required	Yes
G5	Legal Status and Property Rights	Required	Yes
CL1	Withou project climate scenario	Required	Yes
CL2	Net Psotive Climate Impacts	Required	Yes
CL3	Offsite Climate Impacts	Required	Yes
CL4	Climate Impact Monitoring	Required	Yes
GL1	Climate Change Adaptation Benefits	Optional	Yes
CM1	Without project Scenario for Communities	Required	Yes
CM2	Net Positive Community Impacts	Required	Yes
CM3	Offsite Stakeholder Impacts	Required	Yes

CM4	Community Impact Monitoring	Required	Yes
GL2	Exceptional Community Benefits	Optional	Yes
B1	Without project Biodiversity Scenario	Required	Yes
B2	Net Positive Biodiversity Impact	Required	Yes
B3	Offsite Biodiversity Impacts	Required	Yes
B4	Biodiversity Impacts Monitoring	Required	Yes
GL3	Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits	Optional	Yes

## 2 METHODOLOGY

### 2.1 CCBA Standard

AENOR conducted its assessment to validate claims that the project is conform to the Standards of the CCB (Third Edition). The CCB Standard requires compliance with 20 criteria in each of 4 categories: 1) General (5 criteria), 2) Climate (4 criteria), 3) Community (4 criteria), and 4) Biodiversity (4 criteria). In addition, applicants can achieve a higher level of validation through the application of three optional criteria (Gold Level criteria). The validation Gold level can be achieved by projects that meet the baseline requirements and at least one optional criterion gold level.

### 2.2 Validation Team

Lead Auditor: José Luis Fuentes Pérez

Auditor: Manuel García-Rosell

### 2.3 Validation process

The validation of the project is based on the following stages:

- Initial desk review of the PDD for public comment period.
- Site visit.
- Review of stakeholders comments.
- Issuance of clarifications, non conformities or forward actions requests.
- Answer of the project proponent to the issues raised by the Validation/Verification Body

- Desk review and making of the draft validation report
- Technical review and approval of the draft validation report by AENOR
- Issuance of the final report

### 3 STAKEHOLDERS COMMENTS

#### 3.1 General Section

This section tackles the original conditions of the project such as baseline, additionality, design and objectives, management capacity, stakeholder engagement, legal status and property rights.

##### 3.1.1 G1. Project Goals, Design and Long-term Viability

The project has clear objectives to generate climate, community and biodiversity benefits and is designed to meet these objectives. Risks are identified and managed to generate and maintain project benefits within and beyond the life of the project.

<p><b>Project Overview</b></p> <p><b>1 – Identify the primary Project Proponent which is responsible for the project’s design and implementation and provide contact details.</b></p> <p><b>2 – Define the project’s climate, community and biodiversity objectives.</b></p> <p><b>3 – Provide the location (country, sub-national jurisdictions(s)) and a brief overview of the basic physical and social parameters of the project.</b></p>	<p>All these issues have been defined in the PDD. The primary PP is Fundación Defensores de la Naturaleza.</p> <p>The objectives are clearly defined in the PD and supported documentation. The cover page of the PDD states these objectives.</p> <p>The project is located in the National Park Sierra de Lacandon in Department Peten, Guatemala.</p>
<p>Evidence</p>	<p>PDD, KMZ files, interviews with stakeholders, management plan.</p>
<p>Finding</p>	<p>CL 1 against G.1.3</p> <p>Further information shall be provided about the Communities in the project zone as well as information about disputes, conflicts, migration, etc.</p> <p>This clarification is closed, PPs have strengthened the PDD with more information about the communities without cooperation agreements with CONAP, initially not</p>



considered. Other issues such as migration, disputes, conflicts, etc were also reported in the PDD.

**Project Design and boundaries**

**4. Define the boundaries of the Project Area where project activities aim to generate net climate benefits and the Project Zone where project activities are implemented.**

**5. Explain the process of stakeholder identification and analysis used to identify Communities, Community Groups and Other Stakeholders.**

**6. List all Communities, Community Groups and Other Stakeholders identified using the process explained in G 1.5.**

**7. Provide a map identifying the location of Communities and the boundaries of the Project Area(s), of the Project Zone, including any High Conservation Value areas (identified in CM1 and B1), and of additional areas that are predicted to be impacted by project activities identified in CL3, CM3 and B3.**

**8. Briefly describe each project activity and the expected outputs, outcomes and impacts of the activities identifying the causal relationships that explain how the activities will achieve the project's predicted climate, community and biodiversity benefits.**

**9. Define the project start date and lifetime, and GHG accounting period and biodiversity and community benefits assessment period if relevant,**

Section 1.2 of the PD defines de boundaries of the project. Activities to achieve the objectives will be implemented in Cooperatives La Lucha, La Técnica Agropecuaria and Unión Maya Itza as well as the properties of FDN Los Naranjitos and Centro Campesino.

According to comments received from PPs at the beginning of the process it was contemplated to integrate all communities within the SLNP. However, in the SLNP there are several regimes of land tenure: state owned land, cooperatives with private ownership, individually private property as well as the communities on state owned land with historic land rights and with or without signed cooperation agreements. Due to these different categories of land tenure within the SLNP, negotiation with all actors was difficult. Therefore, it was decided to initiate the first instance of the project with private landowners only: Técnica Agropecuaria, La Lucha, Unión Maya Itza (which are private ownerships) and the private properties of FDN.

In the region, FDN identified the following groups:

- Women's Committee of Ramon
- ACOFOP
- Pastoral Social of Petén
- Forest Monitoring Committee for Cooperative
- Young Promoters of Sexual and Reproductive Health
- Community Tourism in La Técnica Agropecuaria Cooperative

All of them have participated in the process, mostly of them were interviewed by AENOR during site visit providing to the validation team a valuable information about their

<p><b>and explain and justify any differences between them. Define an implementation schedule, indicating key dates and milestones in the project's development.</b></p>	<p>thoughts over the project.</p> <p>Maps are provided in the PDD.</p> <p>The project has defined several strategies with activities to develop them. An implementation schedule has been provided along with impacts and mitigation measures for negative impacts. These are the followings:</p> <p>Strategy 1: Adjustment of land uses and land use rights in communities without land registry</p> <p>Project activity 1: Signature and enforcement of cooperation agreements</p> <p>Strategy 2: Forest protection and biodiversity programs</p> <p>Project activity 2: Establishment of a program of patrols and surveillance subcommittee for each organization within the park.</p> <p>Project activity 3: Workshops about fire management in the communities</p> <p>Project activity 4: Program for conservation of habitats linked to endangered species and development of a plan for conservation of HCV</p> <p>Strategy 3: Sustainable farming and livestock familiar management systems</p> <p>Project activity 5: School of agroforestry promoters for enhancing practices sustainable agriculture in the communities</p> <p>Strategy 4: Diversification and use of communal forestry resources</p> <p>Project activity 6: Identification of alternative NTFPs and market study on each case.</p> <p>Project activity 7: Development of a census of populations of species of flora/fauna that have historically been subject to commercial extraction and their most common</p>
--	---

	<p>geographical location.</p> <p>Project activity 8: Development of sustainable forest management plans for small holders and communities.</p> <p>Project activity 9: Establishment and reinforcement of a program of micro-credits and the promotion of conservation and forest management.</p> <p>Strategy 5: Improved management of the SLNP</p> <p>Project activity 10: Human resources plan focusing on contracting permanent personnel (not seasonal jobs).</p> <p>Strategy 6: Community dialog, education and capacitation Project activity 11: Community empowerment and capacity building</p> <p>Strategy 7: Health and welfare of communities</p> <p>Project activity 12: Workshops about sexual and reproductive health in communities</p> <p>Project activity 13: Workshops water and waste management</p> <p>The project has a lifetime of 30 years starting on February 1 2012. The implementation schedule has been provided with main milestones.</p>
Evidence	<p>PDD, implementation schedule, management plan, interviews with stakeholders.</p>
Findings	<p>CL 2 against G1.5</p> <p>Information about the Community Groups in Communities shall be provided.</p> <p>This clarification is closed. Community groups were identified as response to G1.5. they are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Women's Committee of Ramon</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ACOFOP</li> <li>- Pastoral Social of Petén</li> <li>- Forest Monitoring Committee for Cooperative</li> <li>- Young Promoters of Sexual and Reproductive Health</li> <li>- Community Tourism in La Técnica Agropecuaria Cooperative</li> </ul> <p>Some of them were interviewed during site visit.</p>
--	--

<p><b>Risk Management and Long-term Viability</b></p> <p><b>10. Identify likely natural and human-induced risks to the expected climate, community and biodiversity benefits during the project lifetime and outline measures needed and taken to mitigate these risks.</b></p> <p><b>11. Describe the measures needed and taken to maintain and enhance the climate, community and biodiversity benefits beyond the project lifetime.</b></p> <p><b>12. Demonstrate that financial mechanisms adopted, including actual and projected revenues from GHG emissions reductions or removals and other sources, provide an adequate actual and projected flow of funds for project implementation and to achieve the project's climate, community and biodiversity benefits.</b></p>	<p>FDN has carried out an assessment of risks. The table 9 in the PD assess these risks in biophysical, socioeconomic, political, space and institutional scopes. The positive and negative impacts were identified and measures to mitigate them included.</p> <p>The project has developed measures to mitigate risk to climate, community and biodiversity benefits over the project life through different activities.</p> <p>For climate issues, the main measure is to achieve payments for carbon credit. In addition, the project activities will directly mitigate human-induced climate benefit impacts through the forestry activities and the long term forest protection integrating communities' members in the conservation goals of the project.</p> <p>It is important to hold the participation and interests of the communities in the project not only in its design but also in the implementation of project activities in order to reach the climate, community and biodiversity targets. In this regard, it is key that communities be informed of benefits for each stage.</p> <p>For the biodiversity risks, the mitigation measures will be a consequence of the monitoring and reporting mechanisms elaborated with the community to secure the success. Coaching and training on monitoring will be provided to interested key members of the community.</p>
---	---

	<p>Section 2.4.1 establishes the measures to maintain the HCV.</p> <p>The project expects to minimize risks to the expected climate, community and biodiversity benefits and maintaining those benefits beyond the lifetime of the project. This will be based on a efficient monitoring plan and a good identification of risks to determine appropriate mitigation measures. The VCS project crediting period is 30 years, which has started in 2012 and will end in 2042, where the project benefits are expected to last far beyond this timeframe.</p> <p>FDN co-administrates the SLNP together with CONAP since 1999. During this time CONAP has co-financed part of the activities undertaken by FDN and that aim for protecting the area of Sierra del Lacandón according to its status of Protected Area.</p> <p>In this regard, the preparation project "Lacandón - Forests for Life" is funded by the European Union (EU) with funds from the thematic programme for Environment and Sustainable Management of Natural Resources of the European Union (ENRTP), and the International Climate Initiative of the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Protection and Nuclear Safety (BMU- IKI).</p> <p>On February 22<sup>nd</sup> of 2013, CONAP, FDN and OroVerde signed a cooperation agreement that aims to reduce the deforestation in the National Park Sierra del Lacandón (SLNP) and proposed REDD+ as a mechanism for ensuring the necessary financing for developing additional activities.</p> <p>FDN as primary PP is looking for permanently agreements in mostly cases at international level with governmental and non-governmental organizations to develop their activities. At the present moment, the project has secured enough funds to develop the project before the breakeven point is reached.</p>
Evidence	PDD, interviews with communities and their governance organism, interviews with OroVerde staff personnel, agreement between CONAP, OROVERDE and FDN,

	financial model.
Findings	No findings

<p><b>Programmatic approach</b></p> <p><b>13. Specify the Project Area(s) and Communities that may be included under the programmatic approach, and identify any new Project Area(s) and Communities that have been included in the project since the last validation or verification against the CCB Standards.</b></p> <p><b>14. Specify the eligibility criteria and process for project expansion under the programmatic approach and demonstrate that these have been met for any new Project Areas and Communities that have been included in the project since the last validation or verification against the CCB Standards.</b></p> <p><b>15. Establish scalability limits, if applicable, and describe measures needed and taken to address any risks to climate, community and biodiversity benefits if the project expands beyond those limits.</b></p>	<p>The grouped project area has been identified. At validation the first instance encompasses the Cooperative of La Lucha, La Técnica Agropecuaria and Unión Maya Itza, and Los Naranjitos and Centro Campesino of FDN. All instances shall be within the National Park Sierra Lacandón.</p> <p>Likewise the eligibility criteria have been defined in the PDD. The first instances at validation fulfil with them.</p> <p>A deep assesment of their applicability is done in the VCS validation report. Eligibility criteria are list in section 4.4.1 of the joint VCS+CCB PDD and in opinion of AENOR fulfils with CCB requirements.</p> <p>The scalability of the project is limited to the forest cover of the SLNP. Financial resources have been identified as a constraint and it could represent a limit beyond which could be negative impacts on communities and/or biodiversity.</p> <p>In order to avoid this situation, PPs have considered some measures: the addition of new instances should have a financial plan and a schedule for activities to ensure the development of the project and achieve the climate, social and biodiversity benefits.</p> <p>FDN considers that areas within the National Park with more options of inclusion in the project are those corresponding to CONAP (areas of the State of Guatemala) since the State of Guatemala is developing a REDD+ National Strategy and the NPSL is a priority conservation area.</p> <p>Furthermore, in case new project activities are added, it should have the corresponding approvals and have the necessary financial resources to promote such activity at least for the initial phase. On the other hand, a pre-feasibility study should be conducted to identify that community and biodiversity benefits are not affected by the</p>
---	---

	implementation of the new activity.
Evidence	PDD, evidence used for first instance.
Findings	<p>CAR 1 against G1.13 to G.1.15</p> <p>The PDD does not provide information for indicators G1.13 to G1.15.</p> <p>This CAR is closed. The PDD were completed for these indicators. The most relevant information is detailed above and further assessed in the VCS validation report.</p> <p>The grouped project area is the National Park Sierra de Lacandon and the eligibility criteria for the inclusion of new instances have been fixed. Financial issues were identified as a scalability limit.</p>

### 3.1.2 G2. Without-project Land Use Scenario and Additionality

The without-project land use scenario describes expected land use or land-use changes in the Project Zone in the absence of project activities.

The project impacts for climate, communities and biodiversity are measured against the expected conditions for total GHG emissions, for Communities and for biodiversity associated with this without-project land use scenario (described in CL1, CM1, and B1). Project benefits must be 'additional', such that they would not have occurred without the project.

<p><b>1. – Describe the most likely land-use scenario within the Project Zone in the absence of the project, describing the range of potential land-use scenarios and the associated drivers of land use changes and justifying why the land-use scenario selected is most likely.</b></p> <p><b>It is allowable for different locations within the Project Zone to have different without-project land use scenarios.</b></p>	<p>To determine the most likely baseline scenario the PPs have followed the requirements of the methodology VCS VM0015.</p> <p>The most likely scenario is the continuation of the pre-project situation, ie, an increase of deforestation by the agent and drivers of deforestation, mainly ranchers and farmers with many tragic consequences such as the increasing of forest fires by slash and burn practices, loss of biodiversity, etc.</p> <p>These practices are driven indirectly by the quest for profitability, environmental degradation, growth of households, and migration among others.</p>
Evidence	PDD, technological annex and visit to the place

Findings	No findings
----------	-------------

<p><b>2.- Document that project benefits including climate, community and biodiversity benefits would not have occurred in the absence of the project, explaining how existing laws, regulations and governance arrangements, or lack of laws and regulations and their enforcement, would likely affect land use and justifying that the benefits being claimed by the project are truly ‘additional’ and would not have occurred without the project.<sup>34</sup> Identify any distinct climate, community and biodiversity benefits intended for use as offsets and specify how additionality is established for each of these benefits.</b></p>	<p>According to information provided, the project benefits would not have occurred in its absence due to the existence of barriers to which the project has to face. The project additionality is checked under the VCS standard and following the steps indicated by the additionality tool.</p> <p>The section G.2.2 of the PDD has been reinforced following the issues identified by the validation team.</p>
Evidence	<p>PDD and assessment of the additionality. Risk analysis.</p> <p>Meetings between FDN and Cooperative, Oro Verde, CONAP.</p>
Findings	No findings.

### 3.1.3 G3. Stakeholder Engagement

Communities and Other Stakeholders are involved in the project through full and effective participation, including access to information, consultation, participation in decision-making and implementation, and Free, Prior and Informed Consent (requirements for Free, Prior and Informed Consent are included in G5.2). Timely and adequate information is accessible in a language and manner understood by the Communities and Other Stakeholders. Effective and timely consultations are conducted with all relevant stakeholders and participation is ensured, as appropriate, of those that want to be involved. Feedback and Grievance Redress Procedures are established and functional. Best practices are adopted for worker relations and safety.

Access to information	Evidence provided by PPs and comments received during site visit with the communities and NGOs collaborating in
-----------------------	---



**1. Describe how full project documentation has been made accessible to Communities and Other Stakeholders, how summary project documentation (including how to access full documentation) has been actively disseminated to Communities in relevant local or regional languages, and how widely publicized information meetings have been held with Communities and Other Stakeholders.**

**2. Explain how relevant and adequate information about potential costs, risks and benefits to Communities has been provided to them in a form they understand and in a timely manner prior to any decision they may be asked to make with respect to participation in the project.**

**3. Describe the measures taken, and communications methods used, to explain to Communities and Other Stakeholders the process for validation and/or verification against the CCB Standards by an independent Auditor, providing them with timely information about the Auditor's site visit before the site visit occurs and facilitating direct and independent communication between them or their representatives and the Auditor.**

the project zone allow AENOR deems that project issues have been divulgated from the beginning to the people affected in the NPSL.

Communities were well informed about the project and their benefits and/or potential impact over their lifes.

To assess all these issues the PPs carried out a Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) of the 3 communities participating in the REDD+ project with sufficient time and transparency, this way the communities could determine, without any pressure or coercion, if they wished to participate or not. Records were provided to AENOR.

In 2013 started the workshops and were constant with cooperatives exposing general concepts of climate change, CO2, deforestation and basic concepts of REDD+. At these meetings the objectives, possible positive and negative impacts expected from the project, benefits and implications that the project could have for their communities and quality of life were explained by FDN. Print media were also used to inform local people, performing an illustrated summary of the Project Design Document and a comic book on climate change which was translated into Q'eqchi language. In addition, periodic newsletter were issued and distributed to communities about the process of the project.

After the informative stage, they were carried out Extraordinary Assemblies to determine if people wanted to participate in the REDD+ project. The three Cooperatives signed an Act of Acceptance of the project, with accompaniment of the organizations ACOFOP, CONAP, Naturaleza para la Vida as witnesses.

The proposed project activities were identified in the workshops with communities where they emphasized the following activities: support for the technification of agriculture and familiar management systems and control and protection of forests. From these meetings emerged the seven project activities strategies.

The main media used to inform the communities about the validation/verification process were the Governance Committee, who transmits this information to their communities and information about project documentation.

	<p>AENOR met with people participating in these Committees and could check how the information flow works inside the community.</p> <p>Additionally, FDN carries out visits to strategic communities. On January 24, 2016; an extraordinary meeting was held to report 1) PDD Lacandón Forest for Life REDD + Project; 2) Progress of REDD+ Project; 3) Process and field visit of validation and verification process. An interesting example of these visits by FDN was the schedule during the audit site visit to the Manantialito Community. There, the current leaders explained to AENOR how they accepted to open their community to the potential activities from FDN. In the recent last years, the old leader was against to receive external help and the community remained isolated.</p>
<p><b>Evidence</b></p>	<p>PDD, interviews with stakeholders, minutes of meetings with governance committees, picture report, training comic.</p>
<p><b>Findings</b></p>	<p>CL 3 against G.3.1 and G.3.2</p> <p>It shall be clarified how the project's information was accessible to the communities and groups offsite the project area and whether information about costs, risks, benefits of the project was accessible before any decision with respect to participation in the project.</p> <p>On the other hand, the Project Rural Appraisal shall be provided.</p> <p>This clarification is closed. The PRA was provided. A complete set of consultation process was provided to AENOR including minutes of meetings, results of consultation, Declarations of non objection, newsletters, etc. This information has also been provided in the PDD.</p> <p>CL 4 against G3.3</p> <p>Further information shall be provided about the measures and communications method used to explain to communities and other stakeholders the process for validation.</p>

	This clarification is closed. The PDD has been improved with required information. A package of evidence for the consultation process with communities has been provided.
--	---

<p><b>Consultation.</b></p> <p><b>4. Describe how Communities including all the Community Groups and Other Stakeholders have influenced project design and implementation through Effective Consultation, particularly with a view to optimizing Community and Other Stakeholder benefits, respecting local customs, values and institutions and maintaining high conservation values. Project proponents must document consultations and indicate if and how the project design and implementation has been revised based on such input. A plan must be developed and implemented to continue communication and consultation between the project proponents and Communities, including all the Community Groups, and Other Stakeholders about the project and its impacts to facilitate adaptive management throughout the life of the project.</b></p> <p><b>5. Demonstrate that all consultations and participatory processes have been undertaken directly with Communities and Other Stakeholders or through their legitimate representatives, ensuring adequate levels of information sharing with the members of the groups.</b></p>	<p>The Stakeholders identified by the project as relevant are those communities in the grouped project area with land tenure or recognised land use rights.</p> <p>In this regard, FDN has been working in the project zone for 13 years, cooperating and collaborating with communities and their COCODES to reach cooperation agreements and looking for a good implementation of proposals. For the Lacandon Project, the Governance Comittes are used to hold the communication between the affected parties. This is the channel to get the inputs from families. In fact, the 7 strategies derived from these meetings.</p> <p>In what has been and is the communication process / project information also they have considered all the agents involved in illegal activities, to prevent their activity. The PPs have provided minutes of meetings, signing of agreements, letters, memory aids, etc. detailed that all participants in the process.</p> <p>Organizations such as Wings, CONAP, ACOFOP helped in the development and implementation of the protocol for the conduct of consent, prior, free and informed consent of those involved, for this purpose a workshop series with the communities within the project area and was held potentially affected.</p>
<p>Evidence</p>	<p>FPIC, meetings, interviews with COCODES, Gubernance Comitees.</p>

Findings	No Findings
----------	-------------

<p><b>Participation in decision-making and implementation</b></p> <p><b>6. Describe the measures needed and taken to enable effective participation, as appropriate, of all Communities, including all the Community Groups, that want and need to be involved in project design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation throughout the project lifetime, and describe how they have been implemented in a culturally appropriate and gender sensitive manner.</b></p>	<p>The project is managed through the “Governance Committee of the Project” that meets periodically and in which each entity has a representative with voting rights. The Governance Committee will be responsible for the design and implementation of project activities, monitoring and general management of the project on site. The cooperatives will participate in the decision making through representation in the Governance committee and collaborate in the implementation of project activities in joint with FDN.</p> <p>The committee will be composed of one principal representative and one alternate representative from each Cooperative and by FDN, as private owners and project partners. The Governance Committee will be operational for the entire duration of the project.</p>
Evidence	Communities agreements.
Findings	No Findings

<p><b>Anti-Discrimination</b></p> <p><b>7. Describe the measures needed and taken to ensure that the project proponent and all other entities involved in project design and implementation are not involved in or complicit in any form of discrimination or sexual harassment with respect to the project.</b></p>	<p>During the days of AENOR in the project area and after interviewing a lot of people from communities living in the area, AENOR did not receive any negative comment about the primary project proponent who is the private proponent participating in the project. In fact, AENOR verified that FDN engages local people for working in the different areas of the project such as “guardarecursos”, technical personnel, etc, then looking for a good relationship with local stakeholders.</p> <p>This practices show that communities had been an inclusive role in the project, according to individual capabilities and independent of gender, cultural identity and religion. Recruiting personnel have as a principle employ qualified and reliable staff whose skills are in line</p>
--	--

	<p>with the requirements and objectives of the project, through technical, transparent and non-discriminatory procedures based on merit and excellence.</p> <p>Therefore, AENOR has not any indication about complicit in discrimination or sexual harassment of the project participants in the project.</p>
Evidence	PDD, interviews.
Findings	<p>CAR 2 against G3.7</p> <p>The indicator G3.7 is not considered in the PDD.</p> <p>This CAR is closed. Information about discrimination is included in the PDD</p>

<p><b>Feedback and Grievance Redress Procedure</b></p> <p><b>8. Demonstrate that a clear grievance redress procedure has been formalized to address disputes with Communities and Other Stakeholders that may arise during project planning, implementation and evaluation with respect but not limited to, Free, Prior and Informed Consent, rights to lands, territories and resources, benefit sharing, and participation.</b></p> <p><b>The project shall include a process for receiving, hearing, responding to and attempting to resolve Grievances within a reasonable time period. The Feedback and Grievance Redress Procedure shall take into account traditional methods that Communities and Other Stakeholders use to resolve conflicts.</b></p> <p><b>The Feedback and Grievance Redress Procedure shall have three stages with reasonable time limits for each of the</b></p>	<p>For conflicts that may arise within the project, communities have the option to present their grievances using the communication channels enabled within the framework and organizational structure of the project. This mainly channel is the Governance Committee.</p> <p>Apart from this, a municipal affairs court exists in Guatemala responsible for resolving these conflicts; thus the project will use this judicial office, if needed.</p>
---	---

<p>following stages.</p> <p>First, the Project Proponent shall attempt to amicably resolve all Grievances, and provide a written response to the Grievances in a manner that is culturally appropriate.</p> <p>Second, any Grievances that are not resolved by amicable negotiations shall be referred to mediation by a neutral third party.</p> <p>Third, any Grievances that are not resolved through mediation shall be referred either to a) arbitration, to the extent allowed by the laws of the relevant jurisdiction or b) competent courts in the relevant jurisdiction, without prejudice to a party's ability to submit the Grievance to a competent supranational adjudicatory body, if any.</p>	
<p>Evidence</p>	<p>PDD, Governance Committee Acts.</p>
<p>Findings</p>	<p>No Findings</p>

<p><b>Worker Relations</b></p> <p><b>9. Describe measures needed and taken to provide orientation and training for the project's workers and relevant people from the Communities with an objective of building locally useful skills and knowledge to increase local participation in project implementation. These capacity building efforts should target a wide range of people in the Communities, with special attention to women and vulnerable and/or marginalized people. Identify how training is passed on to</b></p>	<p>Regardless of the training activities that are planned for the different stages of the project, FDN has carried out a training base for representative of Communities.</p> <p>These records were provided to AENOR. The content of the actions / workshops deals with the main aspects of the project, such as climate change and the carbon market, payment for environmental services, forest management, biological and socio-cultural forest inventories, monitoring and measurement, prevention, etc. The training actions are continuously. In fact, during site visits to control positions, for example, AENOR requested to the workers in place explanations about training received from FDN and others to manage the camera traps, the protocol to undertake if</p>
--	---

new workers when there is staff turnover, so that local capacity will not be lost.

**10. Demonstrate that people from the Communities are given an equal opportunity to fill all work positions (including management) if the job requirements are met. Explain how workers are selected for positions and where relevant, describe the measures needed and taken to ensure Community members, including women and vulnerable and/or marginalized people, are given a fair chance to fill positions for which they can be trained.**

**11. Submit a list of all relevant laws and regulations covering worker's rights in the host country.**

**Describe measures needed and taken to inform workers about their rights. Provide assurance that the project meets or exceeds all applicable laws and/or regulations covering worker rights and, where relevant, demonstrate how compliance is achieved.**

**12. Comprehensively assess situations and occupations that might arise through the implementation of the project and pose a substantial risk to worker safety. Describe measures**

**needed and taken to inform workers of risks and to explain how to minimize such risks. Where worker safety cannot be guaranteed, project proponents must show how the risks are minimized using best work practices in line with the culture and customary practices of the communities.**

illegal activities are detected, equipment, etc.

The implementation of a REDD+ project will represent maintaining, at least, the status quo of the employment opportunities for the communities. This project ensures that all individuals will be given an equal opportunity (based on Guatemala's laws to fill all employment positions (including management) if the job requirements are met and that benefits reach women and the most vulnerable and/or marginalized people in the community without any discrimination of age, sex, marital status, ethnicity, social status or religious convictions, political ideas and/or sexual orientation. Documents explaining national rules on worker's rights and the obligations of both contracting parties will be made available in local languages when relevant.

AENOR verified that FDN provides training and safety equipment. In tasks, where worker's safety cannot be guaranteed, FDN makes sure that the risks are minimized using best practices in occupational health and safety management. Permanent workers of different institutions have social insurance.

However, the PPs and Oro Verde are aware that next investments in equipment for monitoring, safety, etc are needed. This is an input received during site visit.

A list of relevant working laws have been provided and assessed their fulfilment. In this regard, AENOR asked to workers interviewed during site visit about their labor situation and contracts and trainings records were requested to FDN about these workers

Evidence	PDD, Regulations, contracts, training records, training planning, safety equipments, Good practices Manual
Findings	<p>CL 5 against G3.9 and G3.10</p> <p>It shall provided the training records of monitoring crews interviewed during site visit and their work contracts.</p> <p>This clarification is closed. PPs provided the required evidence.</p>

**3.1.4 G4. Management Capacity.**

The project has adequate human and financial resources for effective implementation.

<p><b>1. Describe the project’s governance structures, and roles and responsibilities of all the entities involved in project design and implementation. For projects using a programmatic approach, identify any new entities included in the project since the last validation or verification against the CCB Standards.</b></p> <p><b>2. Document key technical skills required to implement the project successfully, including community engagement, biodiversity assessment and carbon measurement and monitoring skills. Document the management team’s expertise and prior experience implementing land management and carbon projects at the scale of this project. If relevant experience is lacking, the proponents must either demonstrate how other organizations are partnered with to support the project or have a recruitment strategy to fill the gaps.</b></p> <p><b>3. Document the financial health of the implementing organization(s). Provide assurance that the Project Proponent</b></p>	<p>The project is lead by FDN as primary project proponent. FDN is responsible for design and implementation of the project activities, monitoring and general management of the project. The other PPs are the Cooperative UMI, La Lucha and La Técnica Agropecuaria.</p> <p>A cooperation agreement exist between CONAP and FDN for the co-administration of the NPSL, but also cooperation agreements exist between the cooperatives, FDN and CONAP for the support and implementation of the project.</p> <p>Apart from the above, the PDD details other organizations involved in the project, not proponents (Oro Verde, South Pole). For all their roles and responsibilities are detailed.</p> <p>The skills and capacities of all people in charge of the project is appropriately documented and based on many years of experience in the region dealing with communities and developing many project for the sustainable development and conservation of natural resources.</p> <p>A financial model was provided and agreements with different institutions at international level commented.</p> <p>During site visit, staff personnel from OroVerde (a funder of the project) actively participated in the visit to provide its knowledge and to answer requests from audit team.</p>
---	---



<p><b>and any of the other entities involved in project design and implementation are not involved in or are not complicit in any form of corruption such as bribery, embezzlement, fraud, favoritism, cronyism, nepotism, extortion, and collusion, and describe any measures needed and taken to be able to provide this assurance.</b></p>	<p>AENOR has not received any comment or documents from internal or external sources that lead to think that any entity involved in the project is complicit in any form of corruption.</p>
<p>Evidence</p>	<p>CVs, interviews with staffs to validate their knowledge, skills, etc.</p>
<p>Findings</p>	<p>No Findings</p>

### 3.1.5 G5. Legal Status and property rights.

The project is based on an internationally accepted legal framework, complies with relevant statutory and customary requirements and has necessary approvals from the appropriate state, local and indigenous authorities.

The project recognizes respects and supports rights to lands, territories and resources, including the statutory and customary rights of Indigenous Peoples and others within Communities and Other Stakeholders.<sup>56</sup> The Free, Prior and Informed Consent (as described in G5.2) of relevant Property Rights Holders has been obtained at every stage of the project. Project activities do not lead to involuntary removal or relocation of Property Rights Holders from their lands or territories, and does not force them to relocate activities important to their culture or livelihood.<sup>57</sup> Any proposed removal or relocation occurs only after obtaining Free, Prior and Informed Consent from the relevant Property Rights Holders.

<p><b>Respect for rights to lands, territories and resources, and Free, Prior and Informed Consent.</b></p> <p><b>1. Describe and map statutory and customary tenure/use/access management rights to lands, territories and resources in the Project Zone including individual and collective rights and including overlapping or conflicting rights. If applicable, describe measures needed and taken by the project to help to secure statutory rights. Demonstrate that all Property Rights are recognized, respected, and supported.</b></p>	<p>The areas included in the project zone present diverse tenure status. The most representative are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Private owners organized in communities.</li> <li>– Communities established prior to the creation of the SLNP on state-owned lands, with signed cooperation agreements.</li> <li>– Communities established prior to the creation of the SLNP on state-owned lands, but still in process of acknowledgment by Guatemalan Government.</li> <li>– Illegal settlements established irregularly that are not recognised by the Guatemalan Government.</li> <li>– Land owned by the NGO Fundación Defensores de la Naturaleza (FDN) and other private owners.</li> <li>– State-owned land.</li> </ul> <p>AENOR has not detected overlapping or encroachments</p>
---	---

**2. Demonstrate with documented consultations and agreements that**

**a. the project will not encroach uninvited on private property, community property, or government property,**

**b. the Free, Prior, and Informed Consent has been obtained of those whose property rights are affected by the project through a transparent, agreed process.**

**c. appropriate restitution or compensation has been allocated to any parties whose lands have been or will be affected by the pro**

**3. Demonstrate that project activities do not lead to involuntary removal or relocation of Property Rights Holders from their lands or territories, and does not force them to relocate activities**

**important to their culture or livelihood. If any relocation of habitation or activities is undertaken within the terms of an agreement, the project proponents must demonstrate that the agreement was made with the Free, Prior, and Informed Consent of those concerned and includes provisions for just and fair compensation.**

**4. Identify any illegal activities that could affect the project's climate, community or biodiversity impacts (e.g. illegal logging) taking place in the Project Zone and describe measures needed and taken to reduce these activities so that project benefits are not derived from illegal activities.**

**5. Identify any ongoing or unresolved conflicts or disputes over rights to lands, territories and resources and also**

for the project area. All PPs have provided their land tenure to AENOR. The PDD details the main communities settled in the project zone and provides information about the socioeconomic conditions of these communities and the land ownership in these areas.

The records of FPIC have been provided to AENOR.

The process of information to the communities has been undertaken through the technicians of FDN and it has happened at the same time than the announcement for the stakeholder consultation meetings. AENOR verified the role of these technicians in the different areas of the project zone and how the communities “use” them as interlocutor.

FDN together with CONAP has established guidelines for the land use in these protected areas that are reflected in cooperation agreements to be signed together by CONAP and the communities that are currently settled without legal documentation but with historic land rights.

There are identified illegal settlements that occurred after the establishment of the park and are still occurring in some areas. These areas take in the most vulnerable communities. These have been relocated in the past after long legal processes and following the procedures established by the Government of Guatemala.

Thus, if any community or settlement is evicted from the project area will be due to the application of the Guatemalan Law of protected areas and not due to the implementation of the REDD+ project, as it happened already in the past.

For the first instance of the project, the three communities have land titles and the other lands are FDN's properties. Then, there are not planned relocations.

Several illicit activities that affect climate, community and biodiversity aspects present in the region have occurred in the project area in the past and still can be found nowadays. During to the AENOR visit to the control position in Argueta, the “guardarecursos” informed about a recently illicit activity near the point and how they procedured.

**any disputes that were resolved during the last twenty years where such records exist, or at least during the last ten years. If applicable, describe measures needed and taken to resolve conflicts or disputes. Demonstrate that no activity is undertaken by the project that could prejudice the outcome of an unresolved dispute relevant to the project overlands, territories and resources in the Project Zone.**

The strategic situation of the area, being an unpopulated region that borders with Mexico from which it is separated exclusively by a river, has benefited the traffic of illegal substances like drugs and protected fauna or even being persons. Moreover, the project area experiences the illegal extraction of precious woods and expansion of cattle ranching activities through provoked fires. It can be also find some minor examples of irregular mining and irregular but significant extraction of precious vegetative materials like xate (*Chamaedorea sp.*) and endangered and not-endangered wildlife.

This project has been designed in a significant percentage considering these illegal activities that occur currently within the borders of the SLNP. Project activities like the inter-institutional collaboration for patrolling the borders of the park, the regularization of land tenure, the maintenance of facilities that ease logistical implementation of controlling activities, the system for controlling materials coming out of the SLNP, the systems of quick alert in case of emergencies like fire, the capacitation on fire fighting, etc. are mostly focusing on lowering the impacts of the illegal activities that occur currently and seek the eradication of such practices from the area through creating an uncomfortable environment for the individuals that undertake such practices. None of the project benefits will be derived from illegal activities.

The strategy 1 of the project is focused on the signature of cooperation agreements between FDN/CONAP and the communities to adequate the permanence of communities within the SLNP is not finished yet. This project activity will seek enforcing the currently applicable Guatemalan Law on Protected Areas, through securing land use rights for communities that have historic land rights within the park.

There are not disputes or conflict over land tenure in the project area. However illegal settlements occurred after the establishment of the park and are still occurring in some areas. These have been relocated in the past after long legal processes and following the procedures established by the Government of Guatemala. Thus, if any relocation occurs is result of application of law not from project activities.

<p>Evidence</p>	<p>Congreso de la República. 1989. Ley de Áreas Protegidas. Guatemala. The “agreements of intent” and the “relocation agreements” (previously called “Agreement of intentions”) are compromises acquired during January, 1997 and October 1998 between CONAP and 19 communities that were settled in protected areas of Petén.  FPIC, Cooperation agreements, newsletter from Sierra Lacandon, PDD.</p>
<p>Findings</p>	<p>CL 6 against G5.1  It shall be provided evidence of right of use of PPs and the FPIC as well as the evidence of approval of families not participating in the project to the community.  This clarification is closed as evidence required were provided to AENOR. The Declaration of non objection of families out of the project were provided along with the land tenure of cooperatives and FDN and the Free, Prior , Inform and Consent.</p>

<p><b>Legal status</b></p> <p><b>6. Submit a list of all national and local laws and regulations in the host country that are relevant to the project activities. Provide assurance that the project is complying with these and, where relevant, demonstrate how compliance is achieved.</b></p> <p><b>7. Document that the project has approval from the appropriate authorities, including the established formal and/or traditional authorities customarily required by the Communities.</b></p> <p><b>8. Demonstrate that the Project Proponent(s) has the unconditional, undisputed and unencumbered ability to</b></p>	<p>The main laws affecting to the project activities have been detailed in the PDD. AENOR checked the fulfilment of some requirements specially those related to rights or workers. The project has as mainly objective the protection of natural resources along with the sustainable development of local communities, then its design fulfils with the national and local legislation.</p> <p>Community workshops were developed with the approval and advice of the following authorities working with the communities:</p> <p>CONAP (Consejo Nacional de Áreas Protegidas) whose mission is to ensure the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and protected areas of Guatemala, as well as natural goods and services provided, through design, coordinate and monitor the implementation of policies, standards, incentives and strategies, in</p>
---	---

claim that the project will or did generate or cause the project's climate, community and biodiversity benefits.

**9. Identify the tradable climate, community and biodiversity benefits of the project and specify how double counting is avoided, particularly for offsets sold on the voluntary market and generated in a country participating in a compliance mechanism.**

collaboration with other actors.

ACOFOP (Asociación de Comunidades Forestales de Petén) whose main objective is to improve the quality of life of forest communities through community forest management, thereby promoting social, ecological, economic and political sustainability of the Multiple Use Zone of the Mayan Biosphere Reserve.

Naturaleza para la Vida whose mission is to provide local communities the capacity to sustainable use of natural and cultural resources to improve their living conditions.

Religious organization Pastoral Social de la Tierra (from the municipalities of Santa Elena and La Libertad).

Other entities involved are INAB (Instituto Nacional de Bosques / National Institute of Forest), IDAEH (Instituto de Antropología e Historia / Institute of Anthropology and History), Guatemala Army, DIPRONA (División de Protección de la Naturaleza / Division of nature protection), and MARN (Ministerio de Ambiente y Recursos Naturales / Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources).

AENOR held interviews with CONAP, ACOFOP, Pastoral, Wings, and personnel from DIPRONA and IDAEH. All these organizations gave their complete support and their authorization to the project.

As commented above, FDN co-administrative the NPSL with CONAP which represents to the State of Guatemala and is also going to participate in the project monitoring activities though CEMEC/CONAP. Then, the project has the support from the national and local authorities.

This project has established a Governance Committee with legal entity in which representatives of the participating communities and FDN have representatives (one regular and one substitute). The carbon credits will be awarded to this committee, in which the decision of allocating revenues generated through its commercialization will have to be taken by consensus.

GHG emission removals generated by the project will not be used for compliance with an emissions trading program or to meet binding limits on GHG emissions. Given that

	<p>Guatemala does not have any international compromise considering emission caps under any compliance scheme, no double counting issues are applicable to this case.</p> <p>This issue was treated with FDN and the participation of the project in other schemes was cross checked by AENOR.</p>
Evidence	<p>Cooperation agreements, Gobernance Comitte functions, interviews, minutes of meetings.</p>
Findings	<p>No Findings.</p>

### 3.2 Climate Section

#### 3.2.1 CL1 Without project Climate Section

Estimates of total GHG emissions in the Project Area under the without-project land use scenario are described.

<p><b>1. Estimate the total GHG emissions inside the Project Area under the without-project land use scenario (described in G2) using an Approved or Defensible methodological approach. The timeframe for this analysis is the project GHG accounting period or the project lifetime. In the without-project scenario, it is allowable for the analysis to exclude GHG emissions from sources such as biomass burning, fossil fuel combustion, synthetic fertilizers, and to exclude non-CO2 GHG emissions such as CH4 and N2O gases, in cases where this can be justified as conservative.</b></p> <p><b>The analysis of GHG emissions or removals must include carbon pools expected to increase significantly under the without-project scenario.</b></p>	<p>The total GHG emissions inside the project area in the baseline scenario have been estimated using the steps in the methodology and tools referenced in it. Audit team has checked during the validation process that these calculations have been carried out as required by methodology and tools.</p> <p>In opinion of the validation team, the estimates were made according to the requirements of the VCS, the formulas applied are consistent with the methodology and tools, assumptions and approaches used are conservative and the results are a reliable estimate of the project emissions avoided.</p> <p>For the CCB standard, AENOR judges that the methodology is adequate and meets their requirements.</p> <p>The results are included in the Climate section and show the net benefits of the project in the Climate category.</p> <p>Emissions of non-CO2 gases have been estimated and dismissed as insignificant, do not exceed 5% of the total project emissions.</p> <p>No other different emissions when significant than those</p>
---	---

	mentioned in the indicator were identified.
Evidence	<p>PDD, spreadsheet calculations.</p> <p>AENOR checked during validation the correct application of methodological tools and procedures applied. In our opinion, the applicability to the project is adequate. Formulas are considered consistent with the methodology and tools, assumptions applied are conservative and the results are a reliable estimate of avoided emissions project.</p>
Findings.	No Findings

### 3.2.2 CL2 Net Positive Climate Impacts

The project reduces GHG emissions over the project lifetime from project activities within the project area.

<p><b>1. Estimate the total GHG emissions expected from land use activities inside the project area under the with-project land use scenario using an Approved or Defensible methodological approach. This estimate must be based on clearly defined and defensible assumptions about changes in GHG emissions under the with-project scenario over the project lifetime or the project GHG accounting period. The GHG emissions estimate must include non CO2 emissions such as CH4 and N2O (in terms of CO2-equivalent). and GHG emissions from sources such as biomass burning, fossil fuel combustion, use of synthetic fertilizers and the decomposition of Nfixing species, etc., if those GHG emissions sources are cumulatively likely to account for more than 20% of the project's expected total GHG emissions in the with-project scenario.</b></p> <p><b>2. Demonstrate that the net climate impact of the project is positive. The net climate impact of the project is the</b></p>	<p>The total GHG emissions inside the project area in the baseline scenario have been estimated using the steps in the methodology and tools referenced in it. Audit team has checked during the validation process that these calculations have been carried out as required by methodology and tools.</p> <p>In opinion of the validation team, the estimates were made according to the requirements of the VCS, the formulas applied are consistent with the methodology and tools, assumptions and approaches used are conservative and the results are a reliable estimate of the project emissions avoided.</p> <p>For the CCB standard, AENOR judges that the methodology is adequate and meets their requirements.</p> <p>The results are included in the Climate section and show the net benefits of the project in the Climate category.</p> <p>Emissions of non-CO2 gases have been estimated and dismissed as insignificant, do not exceed 5% of the total project emissions.</p> <p>No other different emissions when significant than those mentioned in the indicator were identified.</p>
---	---

<p><b>difference between the total GHG emissions or removals in the without project scenario (including CO2 and non-CO2 GHG emissions) and total GHG emissions or removals resulting from project activities, minus any project-related negative offsite climate impacts ('Leakage' see CL3).</b></p>	<p>According to the latest information provided the net emissions avoided for the total of 30 years of the project is 7,166,267 tnCO2. In any case, the net benefits are positive Climate.</p>
<p>Evidence</p>	<p>PDD, spreadsheet calculations.</p> <p>AENOR checked during validation the correct application of methodological tools and procedures applied. In our opinion, the applicability to the project is adequate. Formulas are considered consistent with the methodology and tools, assumptions applied are conservative and the results are a reliable estimate of avoided emissions project.</p>
<p>Findings</p>	<p>No Findings</p>

**3.2.3 CL3 Offsite Climate Impacts.**

Increased GHG emissions that occur beyond the project area caused by project activities ('Leakage') are assessed and mitigated and accounted for in the demonstration of net climate impacts.

<p><b>1. Determine the types of Leakage that are expected and estimate offsite increases in GHG emissions due to project activities using an Approved or Defensible methodological approach.</b></p> <p><b>Where relevant, define and justify where Leakage is most likely to take place.</b></p> <p><b>2. Describe the measures taken to mitigate Leakage.</b></p> <p><b>3. Non-CO2 emissions must be included if they are likely to account for more than 20% of the total Leakage emissions (in terms of CO2-equivalent) following the procedures for including or excluding non-CO2 emissions described</b></p>	<p>Leakage expected to be find as a result of the project activities were determined in compliance with the methodology.</p> <p>Both the PDD and annex detail mitigation measures for leakage. The project has a leakage belt and leakage management areas that are not forest. Among the main measures to stop leaks are prevention and fire control, control of illegal activities, promotion of uses of non-timber forest products, training, etc.</p> <p>The PDD, the methodological annex and spreadsheets appropriately considered an estimation of leakage. This requires a displacement leakage factor to the outside the project area. The DLF applied is 5% based on studies by FDN.</p> <p>In the calculations provided they were taken into consideration emissions of non-CO2 gases. They were</p>
---	---



<b>in CL 2.1.</b>	quantified according to the methodology and associated tools and their estimation is insignificant compared to the total project benefits.
Evidence	Spreadsheets, PDD, annex, DLF report, Guatecarbon baseline information. Causes and Agents of Deforestation in National Park Sierra de Lacandón by FDN.
Findings	No Findings

### 3.2.4 CL4 Climate Impact Monitoring.

Climate impact monitoring assesses changes (within and outside the Project Area) in project-related carbon pools, project emissions, and non-CO2 GHG emissions if relevant, resulting from project activities.

<p><b>1. Develop and implement a plan for monitoring changes in relevant carbon pools, non-CO2 GHGs and emissions sources and leakage (as identified in CL1, CL2 and CL3) using an Approved or Defensible methodological approach and following the defined frequency of monitoring of defined parameters. Emissions sources to monitor must include any sources expected to cumulatively contribute more than 20% of total GHG emissions in the with-project scenario (See footnote to CL2.1). Where the methodological approach used to estimate leakage under CL3 requires monitoring, this leakage must be monitored.</b></p> <p><b>2. Disseminate the monitoring plan and any results of monitoring undertaken in accordance with the monitoring plan, ensuring that they are made publicly available on the internet and summaries are communicated to the Communities and Other Stakeholders through appropriate means.</b></p>	<p>The project proponents have developed a monitoring plan that sets the objectives, the pools to be monitored, methodology, activities, frequencies, and tools to follow.</p> <p>This document fulfills the requirements of both VCS and CCBS, the monitoring procedures herewith described fulfill all criteria needed for both standards.</p> <p>Monitoring will be developed by FDN, whereas other governmental and non-governmental institutions may also participate in the process of data gathering on the field. The data generated during monitoring will be stored by FDN. FDN will be responsible for the gathering and process of all necessary data on the field for community and biodiversity monitoring. CEMEC/CONAP will be responsible for the gathering and process of all data for climate monitoring needed for future VCS verification events. A quality assurance/ quality control process of the information generated by each institution will occur along the time and strengthen before any verification event. Any non-conformity found during the internal auditing exercises will be documented, communicated and solved within 3 months after its detection.</p> <p>All results will be publicly available on the internet and summaries are communicated to the Communities and Other Stakeholders through appropriate media, being the main one the Governance Comittes.</p>
--	--

Evidence	PDD y anexo metodológico.
Findings	No Findings

**3.2.5 GL 1 Climate Change Adaptation Benefits. Optional Criterion**

The project provides significant support to assist Communities and/or biodiversity in adapting to the impacts of climate change. Strategies to help Communities and biodiversity adapt to climate change are identified and implemented.

<p><b>1. Identify likely regional or sub-national climate change and climate variability scenarios and impacts, using available studies, and identify potential changes in the local land use scenario due to these climate change scenarios in the absence of the project.</b></p> <p><b>2. Demonstrate that current or anticipated climate changes are having or are likely to have an impact on the well-being of Communities and/</b></p> <p><b>3. Describe measures needed and taken to assist Communities and/or biodiversity to adapt to the probable impacts of climate change based on the causal model that explains how the project activities will achieve the project’s predicted adaptation benefits.</b></p> <p><b>4. Include indicators for adaptation benefits for Communities and/or biodiversity in the monitoring plan. Demonstrate that the project activities assist Communities and/or biodiversity to adapt to the probable impacts of climate change. Assessment of impacts of project activities on Communities must include an evaluation of the impacts by the affected Communities.</b></p>	<p>In Guatemala the agriculture sector has a key role in the economy of the country as PDD states. According to the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean the Climate Change has a direct impact in the agriculture sector and could represent big losses in the Gross Domestic Product by 2100. The last natural disaster occurred in the country such as hurricanes Mitch and Stan were the basis in the study.</p> <p>These reports and others used to define the baseline scenario in projects such as Guatecarbon bring to light that Guatemala is particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change. Increases in fires, droughts, etc are some of the consequences in the absence of these kinds of projects. In fact, during site visit to the Lacandon project the AENOR team could see the devastating consequences of the fires in last years with a loss of forests in large areas provoking big problems for water sources.</p> <p>The increase in atmospheric temperature and sea, reduction and regime instability rainfall and sea level rise, further the intensification of weather phenomena extremes such as droughts and hurricanes will impact production, infrastructure, livelihoods, health and safety of the population, and that will weaken the ability of environment to provide vital resources and services. Due to its socio-economic conditions local communities will be implicitly forced to adapt to this changing climate. Their results show that, in a rather severe climate scenario, the value of land 30% for 2100 will be reduced. According to ClimateWizard, Guatemala by 2050 would have an increase on temperature of nearly 2° C.</p> <p>CEPAL conducted an assessment of the economic impacts related to climate change on Guatemala's agricultural</p>
--	---

	<p>sector by the year 2100, shows that the losses could range from 3% and 15% of GDP (considering a discount rate of 2%), depending on the severity of climate scenario estimate.</p> <p>In Opinion of AENOR, the project provides support to assist communities and biodiversity in adapting to the impacts of climate change.</p> <p>The project will strengthen the communities' capacity to cope with future climate change.</p> <p>The project explicitly addresses scenarios that are predicted attending to future climate change, e.g. by selecting agricultural techniques that better conserve moisture and the soil fertility.</p> <p>Implementation of the project is expected to create positive net climate change impacts. The increase in forest cover and sequestration of carbon in living biomass will contribute to the reduction of green house gas emissions by acting as sinks of CO<sub>2</sub>.</p>
Evidence	<p>PDD</p> <p>Mora et al., 2010. <a href="http://repositorio.cepal.org/bitstream/handle/11362/25917/LCmexL963_es.pdf?sequence=1">http://repositorio.cepal.org/bitstream/handle/11362/25917/LCmexL963_es.pdf?sequence=1</a></p> <p>Congreso de la República Gt. Decreto Número 7-2013 Guatemala: Efectos del cambio climático sobre la agricultura. 2010.</p>
Findings	No Findings

### 3.3 Community Section

#### 3.3.1 CM1 Without Project Community Scenario

Original well-being conditions for Communities and expected changes under the without-project land use scenario are described.

<p><b>1. Describe the Communities at the start of the project and significant community changes in the past, including well-being information, and any community characteristics. Describe the social, economic and cultural diversity within the communities and the differences and interactions between the Community Groups.</b></p> <p><b>2. Evaluate whether the Project Zone includes any of the following High Conservation Values (HCVs) related to community well-being and describe the qualifying attributes for any identified HCVs:</b></p> <p><b>a. Areas that provide critical ecosystem services;</b></p> <p><b>b. Areas that are fundamental for the livelihoods of Communities; and</b></p> <p><b>c. Areas that are critical for the traditional cultural identity of Communities.</b></p> <p><b>Identify the areas that need to be managed to maintain or enhance the identified HCVs.</b></p> <p><b>3. Describe the expected changes in the well-being conditions and other characteristics of Communities under the without-project land use scenario, including the impact of likely changes on all ecosystem services in the Project Zone identified as important to Communities.</b></p>	<p>PDD provides in its section 1.3.5 a deep assessment of community situation in a pre-project scenario. The main problems suffered by local population were detected using several sources , all of them, clearly listed in the document. The communities, groups in the project zone were identified and their characteristics assessed.</p> <p>The PDD identifies HCVs 5 and 6. Maps are provided with their location.</p> <p>The evaluation of the net benefits to the community and community groups of the project have been based on a comparison with the baseline scenario and structured based on the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach.</p> <p>The most likely land use in the without project scenario is the continuity of frontier agricultural and livestock under conventional conditions of low productivity. In this scenario the social conditions of the communities will continue with high levels of poverty and will not have the expected benefits in the well-being conditions.</p>
<p>Evidence</p>	<p>The PDD provides a list of reports used by PPs to document the communities, communities groups in the project zone and their characteristics, interactions, etc. These same reports have been used by AENOR to check</p>

	the information
Findings	No Findings

### 3.3.2 CM2 Net Positive Community Impacts

The project generates net positive impacts on the well-being of Communities and the Community Groups within them over the project lifetime. The project maintains or enhances the High Conservation Values in the Project Zone that are of importance to the well-being of Communities.

<p><b>1. Use appropriate methodologies to assess the impacts, including predicted and actual, direct and indirect benefits, costs and risks, on each of the identified Community Groups (identified in G1.5) resulting from project activities under the with-project scenario. The assessment of impacts must include changes in well-being due to project activities and an evaluation of the impacts by the affected Community Groups. This assessment must be based on clearly defined and defensible assumptions about changes in well-being of the Community Groups under the with-project scenario, including potential impacts of changes in all ecosystem services identified as important for the Communities (including water and soil resources), over the project lifetime.</b></p> <p><b>2. Describe measures needed and taken to mitigate any negative well-being impacts on Community Groups and for maintenance or enhancement of the High Conservation Value attributes (identified in CM1.2) consistent with the precautionary principle.</b></p> <p><b>3. Demonstrate that the net well-being impacts of the project are positive for all identified Community Groups compared with their anticipated well-</b></p>	<p>The PDD describes the analysis of the impacts of project activities in the communities involved in the project. This section also indicates the expected benefits of the project in the communities for the project lifetime. A comparison between the project and a scenario "without project" is described in terms of socio-economic welfare of communities.</p> <p>The project has used the Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) in order to understand what are the most relevant aspects to achieve sustainable development within the communities.</p> <p>The analysis of the net benefits to the communities resulting from the project activity is organized around the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach (SLA). The SLA includes a framework for understanding the complexities of poverty and guiding principles for action. This framework is designed to centre on people and the influences that affect how they can support themselves and their families.</p> <p>Some of the benefits directly observed by the audit team during the visit was the job creation for the implementation of some project activities such as, monitoring and surveillance, training, sustainable management, social assistance programs, etc.</p> <p>Project activities contribute positively to the High Conservation Values due to the elimination of threats to the MBR, and by maintaining the habitat and the forest ecosystem in general, any high conservation value identified will not be affected negatively by the project.</p> <p>The evaluation of the net benefits to the community and community groups of the project have been based on a comparison with the baseline scenario and structured</p>
---	---

<p>being conditions under the withoutproject land use scenario (described in CM1).</p> <p><b>4. Demonstrate that no High Conservation Values (identified in CM1.2) are negatively affected by the project.</b></p>	<p>based on the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach.</p> <p>A table in the PDD summarizes the improvements in each category of livelihood asset (human capital, social capital, physical capital and financial capital) that the project has provided to the local communities. Net benefits are positive.</p>
<p>Evidence</p>	<p>Interviews with community groups, PDD, project rural appraisal,</p>
<p>Findings</p>	<p>No Findings</p>

### 3.3.3 CM3 Other Stakeholders Impacts

Project activities at least 'do no harm' to the well-being of Other Stakeholders.

<p><b>1. Identify any potential positive and negative impacts that the project activities are likely to cause on the well-being of Other Stakeholders.</b></p> <p><b>2. Describe the measures needed and taken to mitigate the negative well-being impacts on Other Stakeholders.</b></p> <p><b>3. Demonstrate that the project activities do not result in net negative impacts on the well-being of Other Stakeholders.</b></p>	<p>It is unlikely that the project will result in negative impacts on stakeholder groups except those who act illegally, because it aims to abolish its activity.</p> <p>After evaluating and analyzing the documentation provided and talk to the actors, the validation team considered unlikely negative impacts on stakeholders.</p>
<p>Evidence</p>	<p>PDD, project appraisal rural, interviews with stakeholders, REDD+ strategies.</p>
<p>Findings</p>	<p>No Findings</p>

### 3.3.4 CM4 Community Impact Monitoring

Community impact monitoring assesses changes in well-being resulting from the project activities for Community Groups and Other Stakeholders.

**1. Develop and implement a monitoring plan that identifies community variables to be monitored, Communities, Community Groups and Other Stakeholders to be monitored, the types of measurements, the sampling methods, and the frequency of monitoring and reporting. Monitoring variables must be directly linked to the project's objectives for Communities and Community Groups and to predicted outputs, outcomes and impacts identified in the project's causal model related to the well-being of Communities (described in G1.8). Monitoring must assess differentiated impacts, including and benefits, costs and risks, for each of the Community Groups and must include an evaluation by the affected Community Groups.**

**2. Develop and implement a monitoring plan to assess the effectiveness of measures taken to maintain or enhance all identified High Conservation Values related to community well-being.**

**3. Disseminate the monitoring plan, and any results of monitoring undertaken in accordance with the monitoring plan, ensuring that they are made publicly available on the internet and summaries are communicated to the Communities and Other Stakeholders through appropriate means.**

It is necessary to actively involve local people in sustainable development and management of project activities in order to reach the objectives of the project.

In the Community area, the project aims to strengthen local management of natural resources whereby improve the welfare of communities to ensure the success of long-term project.

Regular monitoring of the project's impacts on local communities is undertaken by PPs and documented in the PDD. This is separated into direct and indirect effects of the project. Direct effects are measured by evaluating data reported by the monitoring teams of FDN. Indirect effects are assessed by interviewing people in the project area. A basic questionnaire collects information from all sampled people while two specific questionnaires are tailored toward (a) direct beneficiaries of the project and (b) employees. Monitoring takes place either continuously, or upon verification – at least every five years; the latter in case extra studies like interviews or remote sensing analyses are necessary. The ultimate goal is that all monitoring data is uploaded on an internet platform directly upon data collection.

Assessment of maintenance and enhancement of High Conservation Values (HCVs) will be included as part of the project's standard monitoring procedure. More specifically, it will be covered in the monitoring of indirect project effects, which is scheduled on a 5 yearly basis. Several questions are included in the monitoring procedure for HCVs. They are detailed in the PDD.

All results will be publicly available on the internet and summaries are communicated to the Communities and Other Stakeholders through appropriate media.

The most effective media agreed with communities is the dissemination of periodic newsletter reporting the progress of the project in all its phases. The project considers the translation of important documents to Q'eqchi language. The monitoring plan and monitoring result will be disclosed through the governance committee and workshops with

	communities.
Evidence	Monitoring procedures, variables to be monitored, PDD, MIRA application methodology, SBIA Manual for REDD project
Findings	<p>CL 7 against CM4.1</p> <p>It shall be indicated in the PDD how the community groups evaluate the fulfilment of the project's objectives.</p> <p>This clarification is closed. The PDD was improved in its community section. The monitoring crews of FDN will report data of direct effects of the impacts of the project activities in the communities and questionnaires will be incorporated to measure the indirect effects. Results will be uploaded to an internet platform and informed to the Governance Committee to report the rest of community.</p>

### 3.3.5 GL2 Exceptional Community Benefits. Optional Criterion

The project is a Smallholder/Community-led and implemented on land that they own or manage, and/or is explicitly pro-poor in terms of targeting benefits to globally poorer communities.

The project delivers equitable well-being benefits to Smallholders/Community Members, including short-term and long-term benefits and enhancement of security and empowerment of mallholders/Community Members. Appropriate institutional and governance arrangements have been used to enable full and effective participation of Smallholders/Community Members in decision making, implementation and management of the project and in doing so has managed risks related to aggregating Smallholders/Community Members at scale.

Well-being benefits are shared equitably not only with the Smallholders/Community Members but also among the Smallholders/Community Members, ensuring that equitable benefits also flow to more marginalized and/or vulnerable households and individuals within them.

<p><b>1. a. Demonstrate that Smallholders/Community Members or Communities either own or have management rights, statutory or customary, individually or collectively, to land in the Project Area. The Smallholders/Community Members or Communities have rights to claim that their activities will or did generate or cause the project's climate, community</b></p>	<p>According to information provided from the UNDP reports (Human Development Index) and other national sources detailed in the PDD the project zone registers at least 50% of the households within the communities below the national poverty line in Guatemala.</p> <p>Data are provided in the PDD.</p> <p>The project contemplates several project activities that lead to generate community benefits in a short and long term. Some of them are adjustment of land uses and land use</p>
---	---



and biodiversity benefits.

OR

**b. Demonstrate that the Project Zone is in a low human development country OR in an administrative area of a medium or high human development country in which at least 50% of the households within the Communities are below the national poverty line.**

**2. Demonstrate that the project generates short-term and long-term net positive well-being benefits for Smallholders/ Community Members. Include indicators of well-being impacts on Smallholder/Community Members in the monitoring plan. The assessment of impacts must include changes in well-being due to project activities and an evaluation of the impacts by the affected Smallholders/Community Members.**

**3. Identify, through a participatory process, risks for the Smallholders/Community Members to participate in the project, including those related to tradeoffs with food security, land loss, loss of yields and short-term and long-term climate change adaptation. Explain how the project is designed to avoid such tradeoffs and the measures taken to manage the identified risks. Include indicators of risks for Smallholders/Community Members in the monitoring plan.**

**4. Identify Community Groups that are marginalized and/or vulnerable. Demonstrate that the project generates net positive impacts on the well-being of all identified marginalized and/or**

rights, sustainable farming and livestock familiar management systems, diversification and use of communal forestry resources. Besides, women participation would increase in REDD project.

The indicators of well-being impacts on communities will be evaluate through the “Indirect effects monitored - Social impact” reflecting the improvement in the quality of life within the communities.

The risks for participants in the projects were treated in the PRA as AENOR has checked.

Some of them were:

- Decreased revenues from illegal activities
- Higher control over the expansion of the agricultural frontier
- Believe that you can live only from project
- Mishandling of the project can generate pollution
- The project promotes individualism

The AENOR experience in REDD projects allows confirming that REDD projects are designed to reduce the vulnerability of small groups and improve their livelihood. In the case of Lacandon project, activities such as land tenure regularization; development of alternative economic activities to reduce financial vulnerability; protection of natural resources to reduce environmental vulnerability; and increasing governance capacity enhances the relationship and contact with other institutions, which reduces the vulnerability of the community.

In the National Park Sierra de Lancandon, FDN detected the following Community groups that are marginalized and/or vulnerable due to their rights over land: Communities of Nueva Jerusalén II, Guayacán, El Pital, El Esfuerzo y Nuevo Paraíso 107.

These communities were established prior to the establishment of the protected area law. However the lack

**vulnerable Community Groups. Demonstrate that any barriers or risks that might prevent benefits going to marginalized and/or vulnerable Smallholder/Community Members have been identified and addressed. Demonstrate that measures are taken to identify any marginalized and/or vulnerable Smallholders/Community Members, whose well-being may be negatively affected by the project, and that measures are taken to avoid, or when unavoidable to mitigate, any such impacts.**

**5. Demonstrate that the project generates net positive impacts on the well-being of women and that women participate in or influence decision making and include indicators of impacts on women in the monitoring plan.**

**6. Describe the design and implementation of a benefit sharing mechanism, demonstrating that Smallholders/Community Members have fully and effectively participated in defining the decision-making process and the distribution mechanism for benefit sharing; and demonstrating transparency, including on project funding and costs as well as on benefit distribution.**

**7. Explain how relevant and adequate information about predicted and actual benefits, costs and risks has been communicated to Smallholders/Community Members and provide evidence that the information is understood.**

**8. Describe the project's governance**

of cooperation agreements with CONAP could prevent them to participate in similar projects to the REDD initiative. In addition, these communities are very close to the intangible area of the NPSL, then they constitute a threats for the forest if they do not accept the objectives of the REDD project. Therefore, it is a priority to work with these communities in order to achieve agreements to respect the project activities, adjust of land uses and land use rights. This way will allow them to participate in the future projects and receive the benefits of initiatives carried out.

During site visit, AENOR received the inputs mainly from FDN regarding the actions undertaken at the moment by CONAP and FDN to obtain signed cooperation agreements for these communities to adequate their situation according to the legal jurisdiction that is applicable in the areas of the SLNP. CONAP has already expressed the willingness to maintain the settlements with historic land rights if they follow the guidelines considered by the applicable law.

FDN undertakes periodic local consultations in the project zone to inform about projects and get inputs from local stakeholders in order to include their suggestions as much as possible in the design of initiatives.

The project is generating net positive impacts on the well-being of women and ensuring that women participate in decision-making. At the date, there is a pilot project which primary purpose is to provide financial services to the communities of influence of the Sierra del Lacandón; so that they create opportunities for development and economic growth of the area, through sustainable and aligned with the goals of environmental conservation alternatives. The first phase of the program has achieved a total of 16 beneficiary families, with women as leaders. In August 2012 began the second phase of the program with 13 beneficiary families included as credit management responsible men and women.

AENOR observed during site visit the high relevance of women in the Cooperatives audited. Some women were in charge of financial issues and they were chosen as representatives to be interviewed by AENOR in some

and implementation structures, and any relevant selfgovernance or other structures used for aggregation of Smallholders/Community members, and demonstrate that they enable full and effective participation of Smallholders/Community Members in project decision-making and implementation.

9. Demonstrate how the project is developing the capacity of Smallholders/Community Members, and relevant local organizations or institutions, to participate effectively and actively in project design, implementation and management.

Communities or groups.

The project has establish a Governance Committee with legal entity in which representatives of the participating communities with legal land tenure (La Técnica Agropecuaria, La Lucha and Unión Maya Itzá) and FDN have representatives (one regular with voting right and one substitute). The carbon credits will be awarded to this committee, in which the decision of allocating revenues generated through its commercialization will have to be taken by consensus. Therefore, this Committes are the main instrument for sharing the benefits.

The basis of cooperation with the communities is the cooperation agreements signed between the inhabitants and CONAP. An open and transparent communication is established in all activities and regular exchange communication takes place with the communities living in the park. In addition, periodic newsletter were issued and distributed to communities about the process of the project. The Cooperation agreements were provided for the first instances and this is a requirement fro the new instances.

The analysis of the net benefits to the communities resulting from the project activity is organized around the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach (SLA). The communities were informed throughout a participatory discussion of the pros and cons of developing a REDD+ project including issues such as variability in the carbon market and fulfillment of agreements.

To achieve all the benefits for the communities, exist cooperation agreements established between CONAP and the communities. Organized groups were trained by the FDN and OroVerde to strengthen their work and participation in the project, contributing to stabilize the governance. The continued participation of local people in project activities ensures institutional sustainability, since cooperation agreements recognize the right of residence of local populations and thus ensure their commitment to forest protection. Similarly the project fosters political sustainability by developing national and international policies, so to ensuring the participation of local people and

	biodiversity conservation permanently.
Evidence	Interviews, Cooperation agreements, Minutes of Governance Committees, Sustainable Livelihood Approach.
Findings	<p>CAR 3 against GL 2.2</p> <p>The monitoring plan does not include indicators of well-being impacts on Smallholder/Community Members.</p> <p>This CAR is closed. The monitoring plan was updated to include community indicators. Tables 52 and 53 of the PDD details the indicators with direct and indirect effect.</p>

### 3.4 Biodiversity Section

#### 3.4.1 B.1 Biodiversity Without Project Scenario

Original biodiversity conditions in the Project Zone and expected changes under the without-project land use scenario are described.

<p><b>1. Describe biodiversity within the Project Zone at the start of the project and threats to that biodiversity, using appropriate methodologies.</b></p> <p><b>2. Evaluate whether the Project Zone includes any of the following High Conservation Values (HCVs) related to biodiversity and describe the qualifying attributes for any identified HCVs:</b></p> <p><b>a. Globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values;</b></p> <p><b>i. protected areas</b></p> <p><b>ii. threatened species</b></p>	<p>Sections 1.3.6 and 1.3.7 of the PDD describe the biodiversity in the project zone at the start of the project and threats to that biodiversity.</p> <p>The main data are the following:</p> <p>There are nine terrestrial and two aquatic ecosystems in the park, according to the National Institute of Forestry (Instituto Nacional de Bosques, or INAB). Nearly 100 percent of the national park is lowland tropical rainforest and 90 percent is part of river ecosystems, primarily the mighty Usumacinta River. It is part of the core zones of the Mayan Biosphere Reserve.</p> <p>The PDD provides a complete description with the relevant species. A list of evidence used to describe the biodiversity is in the document and has also been used by AENOR to crosscheck the information.</p>
---	--

<p><b>iii. endemic species</b></p> <p><b>iv. areas that support significant concentrations of a species during any time in their lifecycle.</b></p> <p><b>b. Globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape-level areas where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance;</b></p> <p><b>c. Threatened or rare ecosystems.112</b></p> <p><b>Identify the areas that need to be managed to maintain or enhance the identified HCVs.</b></p> <p><b>3. Describe how the without-project land use scenario would affect biodiversity conditions in the Project Zone.</b></p>	<p>The project zone has a HCV1: Concentrations of biological diversity including endemic species, and rare, threatened or endangered species.</p> <p>Section 1.3.8 of the PDD assesses the conditions in the pre-project scenario. Forest fires, land use changes, removal of wildlife, contamination of natural sources, illegal activities, erosion, encroachment are some of the practices occurring in the project zone at without project scenario. All these activities contribute to increase the deforestation and subsequently to reduce the biodiversity in quantity and quality.</p>
<p>Evidence</p>	<p>PDD and evidence mentioned in sections 1.3.6 to 1.3.8</p>
<p>Findings</p>	<p>CAR 4 against B1.2</p> <p>The indicator B.1.2 is not considered in the PDD.</p> <p>This CAR is closed as the indicator has been included. An HCV1 was considered. Evidence are also detailed in the PDD.</p>

**3.4.2 B2. Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts**

The project generates net positive impacts on biodiversity within the Project Zone over the project lifetime. The project maintains or enhances any High Conservation Values present in the Project Zone that are of importance in conserving biodiversity. Native species are used unless otherwise justified and invasive species and genetically modified organisms (GMO are not used).

<p><b>1. Use appropriate methodologies to estimate changes in biodiversity, including assessment of predicted and actual, positive and negative, direct and indirect impacts, resulting from project</b></p>	<p>To evaluate changes in biodiversity, primary project proponent use the Camera Trap Method. The method selected is Bushnell Trophy Cam which is designed for extreme environments of moisture and high temperatures.</p>
--	--

activities under the with-project scenario in the Project Zone and over the project lifetime. This estimate must be based on clearly defined and defensible assumptions.

2. Demonstrate that the project's net impacts on biodiversity in the Project Zone are positive, compared with the biodiversity conditions under the without-project land use scenario (described in B1).

3. Describe measures needed and taken to mitigate negative impacts on biodiversity and any measures needed and taken for maintenance or enhancement of the High Conservation Value attributes (identified in B1.2) consistent with the precautionary principle.

4. Demonstrate that no High Conservation Values (identified in B1.2) are negatively affected by the project.

5. Identify all species used by the project and show that no known invasive species are introduced into any area affected by the project and that the population of any invasive species does not increase as a result of the project.

6. Describe possible adverse effects of non-native species used by the project on the region's environment, including impacts on native species and disease introduction or facilitation. Justify any use of non-native species over native species.

7. Guarantee that no GMOs are used to generate GHG emissions reductions or removals.

This method may reveal changes in the status of a species over large areas, so it is appropriate for populations of species that exhibit wide fluctuations in short periods of time. The main wildlife monitored by camera traps are jaguar (*Panthera onca*), tapir (*Tapirus bairdii*) and white-lipped peccary (*Tayassu pecari*); due to the state of ecosystems are known through the presence of these species and are under constant threat and listed on IUCN Red List. These species are closely associated with native and primary forest; therefore; conservation strategies are developed to protect the forest and the threatened species.

Apart from this method, for monitoring other relevant situations in the project zone such as forest fires and forest cover, FDN will be helped by CEMEC through the analysis of satellite images.

The net impacts over the project zone are positive compared with the preproject scenario. Among the positive impacts identify for the biodiversity, are those in relation with the interconnection of natural corridors, increases of the populations of endemic and endangered species (this will be proven after monitoring activities), the creation of shelterbelts in waterways with native species and the retention of moisture and restoration of micro fauna as well as the monitoring activities will provide an aknowledge of the biodiversity situation in order to establish strategies for its improvement.

Patrolling is other key activity for reducing the pressure on biodiversity caused by diverse illegal practices.

Conservation of threatened species is the basis of the project's activities. The recovery of ecological niches for endemic, vulnerable or threatened species is favored. The HCV are not expected to be negatively affected by the project. By reducing the deforestation rate in the project area, the project will preserve the habitat for endangered and vulnerable species. Different institutional patrols will monitor its boundaries and areas of influence

In summary, the project is expected to have a strong positive effect on the area's biodiversity.

**8. Describe the possible adverse effects of, and justify the use of, fertilizers, chemical pesticides, biological control agents and other inputs used for the project.**

**9. Describe the process for identifying, classifying and managing all waste products resulting from project activities.**

The project will use species during its agricultural and forestry activities. Invasive species will not be used, at least this is the intention of the PPs. However, this will be an issue to be verified in monitoring by the VVB.

The list of species to be used in the project is the following: *Cedrela odorata*, *Swietenia macrophylla*, *Brosimum alicastrum*, *Theobroma cacao*, *Pimenta dioica*.

The project will have a positive impact on biodiversity outside the project area. This positive impact could also include improvement of the habitat conditions for such threatened species as the tapir (*Tapirus bairdii*), of which few individuals are left in the rest of protected areas of Guatemala.

The project considers use new species but the invasive potential will be a criterion in order to select species. No species that are likely to have a negative effect will be used. The population of any invasive species will not increase as a result of the project since the project proponent promote the use of native species.

The activities envisioned by this project do not foresee the utilization of non-native species or Genetically Modified Organisms. Seeds collected in the project area will be used to establish tree nurseries. AENOR visited a small nursery already working and providing plants for activities with communities.

Due to the project will mostly use native species and will apply agro-ecological practices, then, it is expected reducing the use of fertilizers or pesticides, therefore, its use will be very limited and if applicable, the PPs shall determine the appropriate method and dose.

The PPs will use the prevention as first principle to avoid damages in the ecosystem as a result of project activities. This includes the management of waste resulting from the use of products. The PDD details several measures when using products such as appropriate training, use of equipment, classification and good disposal of wastes, etc.

Evidence	IUCN RED LIST, Lacandon Bosques para la Vida web site, cameras report, Loening and Sautter Valuation and Conservation of Biodiversity 2005, Fuentes, M. 2002. El Cultivo del Maiz en Guatemala. Una guía para su manejo agronómico. Van Lynden (1995). Cited by: FAO. 2004. Guiding Principles for the quantitative Assessment of Soil Degradation with a focus on salinization, nutrient decline and soil pollution.
Findings	<p>CAR 5 against B2.1</p> <p>Methodology used to estimate changes in Biodiversity as a result of the project activity has not been explained in the PDD.</p> <p>This CAR is closed. The method used by FDN has based on Camera Traps.</p>

### 3.4.3 B3 Offsite Biodiversity Impacts.

Negative impacts on biodiversity outside the Project Zone resulting from project activities are evaluated and mitigated.

<p><b>1. Identify potential negative impacts on biodiversity that the project activities are likely to cause outside the Project Zone.</b></p> <p><b>2. Describe the measures needed and taken to mitigate these negative impacts on biodiversity outside the Project Zone.</b></p> <p><b>3. Evaluate unmitigated negative impacts on biodiversity outside the Project Zone and compare them with the project's biodiversity benefits within the Project Zone. Justify and demonstrate that the net effect of the project on biodiversity is positive.</b></p>	<p>The primary objective of the REDD project is to avoid the deforestation and a first consequence is an improvements of negative impacts in the biodiversity category. Hence, no potential negative offsite biodiversity impacts have been identified and therefore no measures or activities have been developed. The project also serves as an example of good practices and innovative approaches in the communities regarding to biodiversity (reforestation and enrichment activities, agroforestry systems) that can be adapted by outside communities.</p> <p>Moreover, the project has defined a Leakage belt and leakage management areas to receive potential activities from areas suffering restrictions due to the implementation of project activities. This way is planned to avoid negative impacts in biodiversity outside the project zone.</p>
Evidence	PDD, design of the REDD project
Findings	CAR 6 against B3.1 to B3.3



	<p>These indicators have not been considered in the PDD.</p> <p>This CAR is closed, section 7.2 of the PDD provides a response to them. No potential negative offsite biodiversity impacts have been identified and therefore no measures or activities have been developed.</p>
--	--

#### 3.4.4 B4 Biodiversity Impact Monitoring.

Biodiversity impact monitoring assesses the changes in biodiversity resulting from project activities within and outside the Project Zone.

<p><b>1. Develop and implement a monitoring plan that identifies biodiversity variables to be monitored, the areas to be monitored, the sampling methods, and the frequency of monitoring and reporting. Monitoring variables must be directly linked to the project's biodiversity objectives and to predicted activities, outcomes and impacts identified in the project's causal model related to biodiversity (described in G1.8).</b></p> <p><b>2. Develop and implement a monitoring plan to assess the effectiveness of measures taken to maintain or enhance all identified High Conservation Values related to globally, regionally or nationally significant Biodiversity (identified in B1.2) present in the Project Zone.</b></p> <p><b>3. Disseminate the monitoring plan and the results of monitoring, ensuring that they are made publicly available on the internet and summaries are communicated to the Communities and Other Stakeholders through appropriate means.</b></p>	<p>PPs have developed a monitoring plan for biodiversity issues based on guidelines published by different institutions like CCBS, UNEP and The King Mahendra Trust for Nature Conservation in Nepal. Table 57 in the PDD details the variables to be monitored.</p> <p>The project has been designed to reduce the deforestation. This involves to reduce the pressure over wildlife in the project area due to its habitats are conserved. Patrolling is a key activity in order to achieve this objective but also to detecting potential illegal activities directly affecting the wildlife as poaching. Besides, the Lacandón Project will develop a program for conservation of habitats linked to endangered species and development of a plan for conservation of biodiversity-linked HCVs identified.</p> <p>To monitor these anticipated impacts, the monitoring plan includes indicators that represent the illegal activities of extracting flora species and wildlife, the prevalent biodiversity in flora and fauna and the project's efforts to reduce the expansion of subsistence agricultural frontier and cattle ranching activities at different levels. This set of indicators will give a holistic picture of the state of the biodiversity over time in the project area, as well as the pressure on the wildlife and the project's efforts to reduce these pressures. Monitoring and reporting will be done at least every five years and will be adapted according to the results and inputs over the time.</p> <p>To a better performance of the monitoring activities the PPs are implementing a smart phone APP. AENOR could check during site visit this matter with FDN and Oro Verde and verified in a small phone of a coordinator the APP and</p>
--	--

	<p>how it works.</p> <p>FDN has standard monitoring procedures to implement in monitoring activities. The monitoring plan developed includes the monitoring of parameters to evaluate the conditions in the HCV1. The approach is the monitoring of all endangered species that qualify the project area as being of HCV1.</p> <p>The sources used to design the monitoring plan contemplate the definition of variables whose monitoring allows assessing the effectiveness of measures taken to maintain or enhance the HCVs.</p> <p>All results will be publicly available on the internet and summaries are communicated to the Communities and Other Stakeholders through appropriate medios. Additionally, all documents and information about the results of the monitoring and verification of this project will be published in the platforms of the VCS and CCB standards as usual.</p> <p>FDN has extensive experience with dissemination of the project to communities. The most effective medium agreed with communities is the dissemination of periodic newsletter reporting the progress of the project in all its phases. The project considers the translation of important documents to Q'eqchi language. The monitoring plan and monitoring result will be disclosed through the governance committee and workshops with communities.</p>
Evidence	<p>Tucker, G., et al. (2005), Guidelines for Biodiversity Assessment and Monitoring for Protected Areas.</p> <p>King Mahendra Trust for Nature Conservation and UNEP WCMC. Cambridge, UK. Monitoring plan, SOPs, PDD, CCBS.</p>
Findings	No Findings

**3.4.5 GL3 Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits. Optional Criterion**

Projects conserve biodiversity at sites of global significance for biodiversity conservation selected on the

basis of the Key Biodiversity Area (KBA) framework of vulnerability and irreplaceability.

Conserving biodiversity at these sites may contribute to meeting country commitments to the Aichi Targets under the Convention on Biological Diversity and with the priorities identified in a National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan.

<p><b>1. Demonstrate that the Project Zone includes a site of high biodiversity conservation priority by meeting either the vulnerability or irreplaceability criteria defined below, identifying the ‘Trigger’ species that cause(s) the site to meet any of the following qualifying conditions and providing evidence that the qualifying conditions are met:</b></p> <p><b>1.1 Vulnerability</b></p> <p><b>Regular occurrence of a globally threatened species (according to the IUCN Red List) at the site:</b></p> <p><b>a. Critically Endangered (CR) and Endangered (EN) species - presence of at least a single individual; or</b></p> <p><b>b. Vulnerable species (VU) - presence of at least 30 individuals or 10 pairs.</b></p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>1.2 Irreplaceability</b></p> <p><b>A minimum proportion of a species’ global population present at the site at any stage of the species’ lifecycle according to the following thresholds:</b></p> <p><b>a. Restricted-range species - species with a global range less than 50,000 km<sup>2</sup> and 5% of global population at the site; or</b></p> <p><b>b. Species with large but clumped distributions - 5% of the global</b></p>	<p>The project area is included within the Key Biodiversity Area (KBA) Selva Lacandóna and Sierra del Lacandón (Mexico/Guatemala).</p> <p>The project zone includes a site of high biodiversity conservation priority due to its vulnerability.</p> <p>The project will monitor wildlife following systematic and scientific methods and will collaborate with Universities and other institutions that may bring additional knowledge on the biodiversity present in the project zone.</p> <p>Many of the areas of the project remain to be explored, and PPs did not find records of the biodiversity presented. This applies specially for the area of sinkholes. AENOR visited one of these singular areas. The PPs identified all of them presented in the project zone.</p> <p>FDN uses the classification of IUCN red list for the project zone. Table 51 of the PDD identifies the species from the IUCN Red List as Vulnerable, Endangered or Critically Endangered within the project zone.</p> <p>The project pays close attention in three species for conservation purposes. These species constitute the biodiversity baseline and they are: The near threatened Jaguar (<i>Panthera onca</i>), the endangered Tapir (<i>Tapirus bairdii</i>), and vulnerable White-lipped Pecari (<i>Tayassu pecari</i>). These were identified by the availability of information, expert criteria, and viability of the species and if it were present in the lists of species threatened CITES and List of Threatened Species of the CONAP.</p> <p>The PDD furnishes information about the population of these species and relevant details about their behaviours and habitats.</p> <p>The baseline was established by placing “camera traps” in the field to obtain species presence data. Mostly of mammalian species recorded via this method were present</p>
---	--

<p>population at the site; or</p> <p><b>c. Globally significant congregations - 1% of the global population seasonally at the site;</b></p> <p>or</p> <p><b>d. Globally significant source populations - 1% of the global population at the site.</b></p> <p><b>2. Describe recent population trends of each of the Trigger species in the Project Zone at the start of the project and describe the most likely changes under the without-project land use scenario.</b></p> <p><b>3. Describe measures needed and taken to maintain or enhance the population status of each Trigger species in the Project Zone, and to reduce the threats to them based on the causal model that identifies threats to Trigger species and activities to address them.</b></p> <p><b>4. Include indicators of the population trend of each Trigger species and/or the threats to them in the monitoring plan and demonstrate the effectiveness of measures needed and taken to maintain or enhance the population status of Trigger species.</b></p>	<p>on the Council of National Protected Area's List of Endangered Species and CITES.</p> <p>Without the project activities, it is expected that the population of these three species reduce dramatically due to land use change and poaching. Their vulnerability is also increasing due to reduction of their habitats. They require large tracts of continuous forest to maintain viable populations over time, so generating mechanisms or tools for conservation of habitats, are protecting other species that share the same habitat type, allowing there a balance of the ecosystem. On the other hand, the previously logged areas are reforested with native species also in IUCN Red list like <i>Swietenia macrophylla</i> and <i>Cedrela odorata</i> or recover over time so that they can be almost natural forests.</p> <p>Indicators for the three trigger species are included in the monitoring plan under "Presence of endangered fauna" indicator. The monitoring is performed using the camera trap method. This method is used for multiple purposes; from identify individual specie to assess population size and various aspects of their ecology and behaviour. For this reason, using camera traps in one of the most important and versatile methodologies for studies of biological research for conservation purposes.</p>
<p>Evidence</p>	<p>Garcia, M &amp; Leonardo, R.2016. Classification of the potential habitat of the Central American tapir (<i>Tapirus bairdii</i> Gill, 1865) for its conservation in Guatemala. Ecosystem Partnership Fund. 2010. Assessing Five Years of CEPF Investment in the Mesoamerica Biodiversity Hotspot. List of Threatened Species of the CONAP, CITES</p>

<p>Findings</p>	<p>CAR 7 against GL3.1</p> <p>The PDD does not identify the criterion for the site of High Biodiversity Conservation priority.</p> <p>This CAR is closed. According to explanations and evidence provided by FDN, the project zone includes a conservation priority area for biodiversity due to vulnerability. This is addressed in the PDD and correctly considered in the monitoring plan.</p> <p>CAR 8 against GL 3.2</p> <p>The PDD does not provide information about trends of population and likely changes in species in the pre project scenario.</p> <p>This CAR is closed. The PDD was updated to incorporate this information. The project focus in three species. They are detailed above. Population data are given and potential changes in the without scenario advanced.</p> <p>CAR 9 against GL 3.4</p> <p>The PDD does not consider this indicator.</p> <p>This CAR is closed. The PDD was updated to include indicators for the trigger species.</p>
-----------------	---

#### 4 VALIDATION CONCLUSION

The review and crosschecking of explanations and justifications in the last PDD with the original sources of information detailed in both the PDD and this report have provided enough evidence to AENOR in order to determine the compliance of the project with all the criteria listed in the Standard Climate Community and Biodiversity third edition. The summary of benefits on the Climate, Community and Biodiversity that will be generated by the project included in the cover page of the PDD is accurate. In the opinion of AENOR, the project meets the requirements of the CCB Standard. Therefore, AENOR recommends the project for registration.

Madrid, 2016-06-18

Luis Robles Olmos



Authorized persor.

José Luis Fuentes



Lead auditor

## 5 ANEXX 1: LIST OF EVIDENCE PROVIDED.

The present list refers to evidence used for the CCB validation but also VCS. The list also details some ones also used in the Guatecarbon validation.

- Map of hydrologic connectivity of Guatemala produced by the seismological, volcanological, meteorological, and hydrological institute of Guatemala (INSIVUMEH).
- Cooperative agreement between the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MARN), Ministry of Agriculture, Cattle, and Food (MAGA), the National Institute of Forests (INAB), and the National Council of Protected Areas (CONAP).
- Free, Prior and Inform Consent (FPIC).
- Laws and regulations in section 1.11 of the P.D
- Legal land tenure of FDN over Los Naranjitos and Centro Campesino and La Lucha, UMI and La Técnica.
- Master Plan for the Maya Biosphere Reserve.
- Technical report of the forest cover map in Guatemala 2010 and dynamic of forest cover 2006-2010.
- Deforestation trends in the Maya Biosphere Reserve, Guatemala 2000-2013.
- [http://www.usaid-cncg.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/MBR-Deforestation\\_150213-ES-2.pdf](http://www.usaid-cncg.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/MBR-Deforestation_150213-ES-2.pdf)
- Governance study of Maya Biosphere Reserve by CONAP 2015..
- Report by Wildlife Conservation Society and Conservation International about Conservation Agreement in Petén.
- Environmental impact assessments
- Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund. 2010. Assessing Five Years of CEPF Investment in the Mesoamerica Biodiversity Hotspot. A Special Report. Available at [http://www.cepf.net/Documents/Final\\_NMesoamerica\\_Assessment\\_Jan2010.pdf](http://www.cepf.net/Documents/Final_NMesoamerica_Assessment_Jan2010.pdf)
- Fundación Defensores de la Naturaleza; CONAP. 2015 Plan Maestro 2011-2015. Parque Nacional Sierra del Lacandón. Unpublished.
- ParksWatch. 2003. Perfil de Parque – Guatemala. Parque Nacional Sierra del Lacandón. Available at [http://www.parkswatch.org/parkprofiles/pdf/slnp\\_spa.pdf](http://www.parkswatch.org/parkprofiles/pdf/slnp_spa.pdf)
- Congreso de la República. 1989. Ley de Áreas Protegidas. Available at <http://www.acnur.org/t3/fileadmin/Documentos/BDL/2008/6696.pdf?view=1>.

- [http://www.chmguatemala.gob.gt/informacion/redes-de-informacion-sistemas-y-bases-de-datos/publicaciones-periodicas-de-instituciones-gubernamentales/Compendio%20Estadistico%20Ambiental%202010\\_vc.pdf](http://www.chmguatemala.gob.gt/informacion/redes-de-informacion-sistemas-y-bases-de-datos/publicaciones-periodicas-de-instituciones-gubernamentales/Compendio%20Estadistico%20Ambiental%202010_vc.pdf)
- State of the Maya Biosphere Reserve. Available at <http://stateofthembr.org/es-es/mapas.aspx>
- Hodgdon, B.; Hughell, D.; Ramos, V.; Balas, R. 2015. Deforestation Trends in the Maya Biosphere Reserve, Guatemala. [http://www.rainforest-alliance.org/sites/default/files/publication/pdf/MBR-Deforestation\\_150213-2.pdf](http://www.rainforest-alliance.org/sites/default/files/publication/pdf/MBR-Deforestation_150213-2.pdf)
- Gobierno de Guatemala. 2015. Contribución prevista y determinada a nivel nacional. Ministerio de Ambiente y Recursos Naturales. Available at: <http://www4.unfccc.int/submissions/INDC/Published%20Documents/Guatemala/1/Gobierno%20de%20Guatemala%20INDC-UNFCCC%20Sept%202015.pdf>
- INAB. 2001. "Mapa de Ecosistemas Vegetales de Guatemala; Memoria Técnica". Instituto Nacional de Bosques (INAB). Guatemala. 39 pp. + anexos
- Stanford Alpine Project. 2005. Field Guide to Guatemalan Geology. Department of Geological and Environmental Sciences, Stanford University. Available at [https://pangea.stanford.edu/research/mahood/bio/SAP\\_Guatemala\\_guidebook.pdf](https://pangea.stanford.edu/research/mahood/bio/SAP_Guatemala_guidebook.pdf)
- APESA. 1993. Evaluación Ecológica Rápida de la Reserva de la Biosfera Maya. Guatemala, Guatemala. APESA/TNC/PBM-USAID. 356 p. + Mapas temáticos.
- Consejo Nacional de Áreas Protegidas (CONAP), FDN, USAIP, TNC. 2005. Plan Maestro 2006 – 2010. Parque Nacional Sierra del Lacandón. Available at <http://www.defensores.org.gt/sites/default/files/Plan%20Maestro%20PNSierra%20del%20Lacandón%202006-2010.pdf>
- Alvarado, G. y Herrera, I. 2000. Mapa Fisiográfico-Geomorfológico de la República De Guatemala Escala 1:250000. Unidad de Políticas e Información Estratégica (UPIE), Área de Planificación, Ministerio de Agricultura, Ganadería y Alimentación, Guatemala. Available at [http://web.maga.gob.gt/wp-content/blogs.dir/13/files/2013/widget/public/mapa\\_fisiografia\\_memoria\\_2001.pdf](http://web.maga.gob.gt/wp-content/blogs.dir/13/files/2013/widget/public/mapa_fisiografia_memoria_2001.pdf)
- CONAP. 2005. Plan Maestro 2006 – 2010. Parque Nacional Sierra del Lacandón.
- Gobierno de Guatemala. 2015. Contribución prevista y determinada a nivel nacional. Ministerio de Ambiente y Recursos Naturales. Disponible en: <http://www4.unfccc.int/submissions/INDC/Published%20Documents/Guatemala/1/Gobierno%20de%20Guatemala%20INDC-UNFCCC%20Sept%202015.pdf>
- Congreso de la República. 1990. Decreto Número 5 – 90. Guatemala



- Milián, B.; Grünberg, G.; Cho, M. 2000. La Conflictividad Agraria en las Tierras Bajas del Norte de Guatemala: Petén y la Franja Transversal del Norte. CARE. Guatemala, Flacso, Minugua, Contierra
- Kashanipour & Mcgee, 2004. Northern Lacandón Maya Medicinal Plant Use in the Communities of Lacanja Chan Sayab and Naha', Chiapas, Mexico. Available at: <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1065&context=jea>
- Lacandóns Mayans. Information consulted October 2015. Available at <http://anth323.angelfire.com/>
- Mixture of Central American Indigenous and European or descendent of European
- Ramos, V.; Solís, N.; y Zetina, J. 2001. "Censo de Población en seguimiento a la Base de Datos sobre Población Tierras y Medio Ambiente en la Reserva de Biosfera Maya." CONAP y CARE Guatemala, cited in Plan Maestro 2011-2015 Parque Nacional Sierra del Lacandón. Coadministración Fundación Defensores de la Naturaleza – CONAP. Unpublished. Document available for auditors upon request.
- CONAP, 2003. Plan Maestro. Parque Nacional Laguna Lachuá. Cobán, Alta Verapaz: CONAP.
- Herrera, R. y Paiz, M. 1999. Plan Maestro 1999-2003 Parque Nacional Sierra del Lacandón. Consejo Nacional de Áreas Protegidas, The Nature Conservancy (TNC), Centro Maya & CARE. 45 pp., cited in Plan Maestro 2011-2015 Parque Nacional Sierra del Lacandón. Coadministración Fundación Defensores de la Naturaleza – CONAP. Unpublished. Document available for auditors upon request.
- Suter, L., López-Carr, D. 2010. "El Nivel de Desarrollo Humano en el Parque Nacional Sierra del Lacandón". 109 pp + anexos, cited in Plan Maestro 2011-2015 Parque Nacional Sierra del Lacandón. Coadministración Fundación Defensores de la Naturaleza – CONAP. Unpublished. Document available for auditors upon request
- MSPAS. 2003. "Consolidado censo de población por grupos de edad año 2003". Área de Salud Norte, Sayaxché. Ministerio de Salud Pública y Asistencia Social. Petén, Guatemala. 3 pp., cited in Plan Maestro 2011-2015 Parque Nacional Sierra del Lacandón. Coadministración Fundación Defensores de la Naturaleza – CONAP. Unpublished. Document available for auditors upon request.
- Suter, L., López-Carr, D. 2010. "El Nivel de Desarrollo Humano en el Parque Nacional Sierra del Lacandón". 109 pp + anexos, cited in Plan Maestro 2011-2015 Parque Nacional Sierra del Lacandón. Coadministración Fundación Defensores de la Naturaleza – CONAP. Unpublished. Document available for auditors upon request.
- Ramos, V.; Solís, N.; y Zetina, J. 2001. "Censo de Población en seguimiento a la Base de Datos sobre Población Tierras y Medio Ambiente en la Reserva de Biosfera Maya." CONAP y CARE

Guatemala, cited in Plan Maestro 2011-2015 Parque Nacional Sierra del Lacandón. Coadministración Fundación Defensores de la Naturaleza – CONAP. Unpublished. Document available for auditors upon request.

- Portillo, M. 2011. Causas y Agentes de la deforestación en el Parque Nacional Sierra de lacandón. Guatemala.
- Gobierno de Guatemala, CONAP. 2009. Portal Nacional sobre Diversidad biológica en Guatemala. Information online. Available at <http://www.chmguatemala.gob.gt/instituciones/noticias-internacionales/pretenden-ocupar-sierra-de-Lacandón>
- Breedlove, D.E. (1981). Introduction to the Flora of Chiapas. In Breedlove, D.E. (ed.), Flora of Chiapas. Part 1. California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco. 35 pp., cited in an online article of the Department of Botany of the Smithsonian National Museum of Natural History, available at <http://botany.si.edu/projects/cpd/ma/ma13.htm>
- Wendt, T. (1993). Composition, floristic affinities, and origins of the canopy tree flora of the Mexican Atlantic slope rain forests. In Ramamoorthy, T.P., Bye, R., Lot, A. and Fa, J.E. (eds), Biological diversity of Mexico: origins and distribution. Oxford University Press, London. Pp. 595-680., cited in an online article of the Department of Botany of the Smithsonian National Museum of Natural History, available at <http://botany.si.edu/projects/cpd/ma/ma13.htm>
- Lundell, C.L. (1937). The vegetation of Petén. Carnegie Institution of Washington Public. No. 478, Washington, D.C. 244 pp., cited in an online article of the Department of Botany of the Smithsonian National Museum of Natural History, available at <http://botany.si.edu/projects/cpd/ma/ma13.htm>
- Márquez, J. 2013. Determinación del carbono secuestrado y liberado en los bosques naturales y sistemas de uso de la tierra del Parque Nacional Sieraa del Lacandón, Peten, Guatemala.
- The data on carbon content of the different forest formations has been obtained from a previous work developed by Carbon Decisions International (Vallejo, A., Navarrete, D., Villegas, J.F., Pedroni, L., Schlesinger, P., Guadamuz, R., Mateo, S., 2012. “Anexo al PD-VCS al PD-VCS del Proyecto REDD+ en la ZUM de la RBM”, unpublished).
- Brown S. 1997. Estimating biomass and biomass change of tropical forests. A primer. FAO
- Forestry Paper No.134. Rome, Italy. 55 p. Available at: <http://www.fao.org/docrep/W4095E/W4095E00.htm>
- IPCC. 2003. Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry. Available at: <http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/gpplulucf/gpplulucf.html>

- FAO. 2004. Inventario Forestal Nacional 2002-2003 / Marquez L. 1999. Elementos técnicos para inventarios de Carbono en uso del suelo. Fundación Solar. Guatemala. Available at: <http://www.fao.org/forestry/23224-015b0b120eb03aa8b646ce6e3095c7a6a.pdf>
- Arreaga, W. 2002. Almacenamiento del carbono en bosques con manejo forestal sostenible en la Reserva de Biosfera Maya, Peten, Guatemala. Available at: <http://orton.catie.ac.cr/repdoc/A0249E/A0249E.PDF>
- De Jong, Ben H.J., Ochoa-Gaona, Susana; Castillo-Santiago, Miguel Angel; Ramírez-Marcial, Neptalí and Cairns, Michael A. 2000. Carbon Flux and Patterns of Land-Use/ Land-Cover Change in the Selva Lacandón, Mexico. *Ambio* Vol. 29 No. 8.
- Institutional website. Available at <http://www.defensores.org.gt/>
- OroVerde website. Available at <http://www.roverde.de/>
- OroVerde international projects. Available at <http://www.roverde.de/projekte-international.html>
- Carr, D.L. 2004. Ladino and Q'eqch' Maya land use and land clearing in the Sierra de Lacandón Lacandón National Park, Peten, Guatemala. *Agriculture and Human Values*. 21: 67-76. Available at: [http://www.geog.ucsb.edu/~carr/DCarr\\_Publications/DLCarr\\_Ag.&HumanValues\\_04.pdf](http://www.geog.ucsb.edu/~carr/DCarr_Publications/DLCarr_Ag.&HumanValues_04.pdf)
- Sierra del Lacandón Newsletter. Available at <http://www.bosques-lacandon.org/en/news/newsletter.html>
- Guatemala Constitution. 1993. Available at [http://www.mintrabajo.gob.gt/images/organizacion/leyesconveniosyacuertos/Leyes\\_Constitucionales/Constitucion\\_Politica\\_de\\_Guatemala.pdf](http://www.mintrabajo.gob.gt/images/organizacion/leyesconveniosyacuertos/Leyes_Constitucionales/Constitucion_Politica_de_Guatemala.pdf)
- National laws on labour, social security and related human rights. Available at: <http://www.ilo.org/dyn/natlex/docs/WEBTEXT/29402/73185/S95GTM01.htm>
- Available at: [http://www.minex.gob.gt/pBase.aspx?ID=/MAYT/MAYT\\_TRATADO\\_ACUERDO/MAYT\\_TRATADO\\_ACUERDO\\_VIGENTEWebReport.aspx](http://www.minex.gob.gt/pBase.aspx?ID=/MAYT/MAYT_TRATADO_ACUERDO/MAYT_TRATADO_ACUERDO_VIGENTEWebReport.aspx)
- Caldh & ILRF, 2004. Labor rights and legal, political, economic and cultural obstacles in Guatemala. Available at: <http://www.laborrights.org/sites/default/files/publications-and-resources/POLICYGuatemalaLaborLaws.pdf>
- Website: <http://www.conap.gob.gt/>
- Website: <http://www.acofop.org/>

- Vallejo et al., 2011. Aplicación de la Metodología VM0015 al Desarrollo de una Línea Base de Emisiones por Deforestación en las Tierras Bajas del Norte de Guatemala
- The International Mire Conservation Group and International Peat Society accounts for a total of 1Km<sup>2</sup> of peatlands in Guatemala. Available at: [http://www.gret-perg.ulaval.ca/fileadmin/fichiers/fichiersGRET/pdf/Doc\\_generale/WUMP\\_Wise\\_Use\\_of\\_Mires\\_and\\_Peatlands\\_book.pdf](http://www.gret-perg.ulaval.ca/fileadmin/fichiers/fichiersGRET/pdf/Doc_generale/WUMP_Wise_Use_of_Mires_and_Peatlands_book.pdf)

### Evidence from Guatecarbon project

- ACOFOP, 2008. Proyecto de Fortalecimiento a la Diversificación Económica y Gestión Local de las Organizaciones Comunitarias de Petén – Proyecto DEGL. ProPetén. Planes de Manejo Comunitario en las Concesiones.
- ASIES, 2005. Mapas de Pobreza y Desigualdad de Guatemala. [http://www.ciesin.columbia.edu/repository/povmap/methods/Mapas\\_de\\_la\\_Pobreza\\_2002.pdf](http://www.ciesin.columbia.edu/repository/povmap/methods/Mapas_de_la_Pobreza_2002.pdf)
- Brands, 2010. Crime, Violence, And The Crisis In Guatemala: A Case Study In the Erosion of the State. Ver: Crime Violence and the Crisis in Guatemala-PUB986-Brands-2010.pdf
- Carr, D.L. 2009. Migration and Deforestation: Why Rural Migration Matters. Progress in Human Geography 33(3): 355-378. Rural-Mig-the-Driving-Force-behind.Defor-nihms116360-Carr-2009.pdf
- Carr, D. L. 2008. Migration to the Maya Biosphere Reserve, Guatemala: Why place matters. Hum Organ. 2008 ; 67(1): 37–48. Migration-to-the-MBR-nihms116361-Carr-2008.pdf
- Carr, D. L. 2004. Examining the Proximate and Underlying Causes of Tropical Deforestation: Migration and Land Use in the Sierra de Lacandón National Park, Guatemala. 2004. AAG Mtg, 2004. Examining-the Proximate and Underlying Causes of Def Mig and LU in SLNP-DCarr\_AAG2004.pdf
- Carr, D.L. 2000. Colonization, clear-cutting, and cornfields: Rural migration and deforestation in the Sierra de Lacandón National Park (SLNP), Guatemala. Proceedings of the Conference of the Latin American Studies Association of America. Miami, FL, March 2000. Ver: DCarr\_LASA\_Proceedings\_00.pdf
- Carrera F, Prins K, 2002. Desarrollo de la política en Concesiones Forestales Comunitarias en Petén, Guatemala: el aporte de la investigación y experiencia sistematizada del CATIE. Revista Forestal Centroamericana No.37 33-40. <http://web.catie.ac.cr/informacion/RFCA/rev37/pag33-40.pdf>
- Carrera F, Morales J, Gálvez J. 2001. Concesiones Forestales Comunitarias en la Reserva de la Biosfera Maya en Petén, Guatemala.

- Castellanos E, Guerra A. 2009. El cambio climático y sus efectos sobre el desarrollo humano en Guatemala, PNUD. Cuadernos de Desarrollo Humano 2007/2008-1. 51 p.
- Colón-García, A.P. 2005. Conocimiento local sobre la quema en sistemas silvopastoriles de El Petén, Guatemala. Programas de Educación para el Desarrollo y la Conservación. Escuela de Posgrado. Centro Agronómico Tropical de Investigación y Enseñanza (CATIE).
- CONAMA, 1999. Estrategia y Plan de Acción Nacional de Biodiversidad GEF-PNUD.
- <http://www.chmguatemala.gob.gt/instituciones/organizacion-y-redes/nacionales/gobierno/conap/otecbio/Estrategia%20Nacional%20de%20Biodiversidad.pdf/view?searchterm=estrategia%20nacional%20de%20biodiversidad>
- CONAP, 2007. Actualización del Plan Maestro de la Reserva de la Biosfera Maya 2007-2011. Análisis Sintético del Estado de la Reserva de la Biosfera Maya. Informe de consultoría. <http://reservasdeguatemala.org/web/documentos/primer.borrados.reserva.biosfera.maya.pdf>
- CONAP, 2004a. Política Marco para el Manejo de Recursos Forestales No Maderables. Documentos de Políticas, Programas y Proyectos No xx.Guatemala: FIPA-AID.38 p. <http://www.infoiarna.org.gt/media/file/areas/bosque/legislacion/Politica%20marco%20de%20no%20maderables.pdf>
- CONAP, 2004b. Política Marco de Concesiones para el Manejo Integral de Recursos Naturales en Petén. Documentos de Políticas, Programas y Proyectos No.38.Guatemala:FIPA-AID.49 p. [http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf\\_docs/PNACX145.pdf](http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNACX145.pdf)
- CONAP, 2002. Política de Asentamientos Humanos en Áreas Protegidas del Petén. FIPA/AID, USAID.26 p. <http://www.infoiarna.org.gt/media/file/areas/poblacion/legislacion/politica-asentamientos-humanos-final.pdf>
- CONAP, 2001. Plan Maestro de la Reserva de Biosfera Maya 2001-2006. Guatemala. 101 p.
- CONAP, 2001 a. Censo de Población en Seguimiento a la Base de Datos sobre Población Tierra y Medio Ambiente en la reserva de la Biosfera Maya. Víctor Hugo Ramos, José Nery Solís, Julián Enrique Zetina. Centro de Monitoreo y Evaluación del CONAP.
- CONAP, 1999. Sistema de Monitoreo y Evaluación en Unidades de Manejo, Zona de Uso Múltiple, Reserva de la Biosfera Maya. Guatemala, 34 p.
- CONAP&WCS, 2011. Evaluación de desempeño mediante sensores remotos, Acuerdo de Conservación en Uaxactún, Reserva de la Biosfera Maya, Petén, Guatemala. Programa Custodios de Conservación. Conservación Internacional.
- Convenio Cooperación Interinstitucional, 2011. Convenio de Cooperación Técnica entre el Ministerio del Ambiente y Recursos Naturales -MARN, Ministerio de Agricultura, Ganadería y

alimentación –MAGA, el Instituto Nacional de Bosques –INAB, y el Consejo Nacional de Areas Protegidas –CONAP.

- Convenio REDD+, 2011. Convenio de Cooperación para Desarrollar la Propuesta del Proyecto Piloto para la Negociación de Reducción de Emisiones por Deforestación y Degradación Evitada en la Zona de Usos Múltiples de la Reserva de la Biósfera Maya.
- Convenio de Cooperación 2009 entre CONAP, OMYC Uaxactún, CI y WCS.
- Eisermann K, Avendaño, C. 2009. Guatemala. Pág. 235 – 242 en C. Devenish, D. F. Díaz Fernández, R. P. Clay, I. Davidson & I. Yépez Zabala Eds. Important Bird Areas Americas - Priority sites for biodiversity conservation. Quito, Ecuador: BirdLife International (BirdLife Conservation Series No. 16).
- [http://www.birdlife.org/datazone/userfiles/file/IBAs/AmCntryPDFs/Guatemala\\_es.pdf](http://www.birdlife.org/datazone/userfiles/file/IBAs/AmCntryPDFs/Guatemala_es.pdf)
- Eisermann K, Avendaño, C. 2007. Areas propuestas para la designación como IBA (Area importante para la conservación de aves) en Guatemala. Sociedad Guatemalteca de Ornitología, Guatemala. 69 p. [http://www.avesdeguatemala.org/iba/IBA\\_Guatemala2007.pdf](http://www.avesdeguatemala.org/iba/IBA_Guatemala2007.pdf)
- Gomes, I. and V. E. Mendes. 2007. Association of Forest Communities of Petén, Guatemala. Prisma-CIFOR. Bogor Barat, Indonesia. [Peten\\_guatemala\\_acofop-gomez-mendez-2007.pdf](http://www.avesdeguatemala.org/iba/IBA_Guatemala2007.pdf)
- Gould, K.A. 2009. Marking Land, Producing Markets: The Making Of A Guatemalan Rural Land Market. M.S. University of Florida, 2001.A PHD Thesis.The University of British Columbia (Vancouver). Ver: [ubc\\_2009\\_fall\\_gould\\_kevin.pdf](http://www.avesdeguatemala.org/iba/IBA_Guatemala2007.pdf)
- Gould, K.A. 2006. Land regularization on agricultural frontiers: The case of Northwestern Peten, Guatemala, Land Use Policy, Volume 23, Issue 4, October, Pages 395-407,
- Grandia, L. 2011. Projecting Smallholders: Roads, the Puebla to Panama Plan and Land Grabbing in the Q'eqchi' Lowlands of Northern Guatemala.Presented at the International Conference on Global Land Grabbing, April 6-8, 2011.Future Agricultures Consortium.Institute of Development Studies.University of Sussex. [Liza Grandia-Roads History-Guat-April-2011.pdf](http://www.avesdeguatemala.org/iba/IBA_Guatemala2007.pdf)
- Grandia, L. 2006. Unsettling: Land Dispossession and Enduring Inequity for the Q'eqchi' Maya in the Guatemalan and Belizean Frontier Colonization Process.Department of Anthropology.University of California-Berkeley. [Land-Dispossess-Inequity-for-Qeqchi-Maya-in-Guat-Belize-Coloniz-Proc-grandia-2006.pdf](http://www.avesdeguatemala.org/iba/IBA_Guatemala2007.pdf)
- Imbach, A. 1999. Sistema de Monitoreo de la Reserva de la Biosfera Maya. CONAP, CIAT. 55 p.
- INE, 2002. XI Censo Nacional de Población y VI de Habitación, Guatemala. <http://www.ine.gob.gt/>

- IPCC,2003. Good practice guidance for land use, land-use change and forestry. Kamiyamaguchi, Hayama, Kanagawa, Japón: The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).
- Jaramillo, Carlos Felipe and Kelly, Thomas J. (1997): Deforestation and Property Rights in Latin America. Mimeo, University of Maryland, College Park. Defor-&-Property-Rights-in-Latin-America-Jaramillo-Kelly-1997.pdf
- Jolon-Morales, M. 2008. Estudio analítico del impacto de las acciones de extracción y tráfico de Vida Silvestre en la región de la Selva Maya. Informe Final Consultoría. Guatemala: CONAP-CONANP-MRNMA-CATIE.
- Loening, L. J. & M. Markussen.2003. Pobreza, Deforestación y sus Eventuales Implicaciones para la Biodiversidad de Guatemala. Economía, Sociedad y Territorio, Julio-Diciembre, año/vol. IV, número 014. El Colegio Mexiquense, A.C. Toluca, México. pp. 279-315. Ver: Loening\_est\_voliv\_num14\_2003.pdf
- McNab R, Radachowsky J, Ramos V, 2004. La Utilidad Práctica del Monitoreo Biológico en la Reserva de la Biosfera Maya. Monitoreo de la integridad ecológica de la Reserva de la Biosfera Maya, Petén, Guatemala. WCS. CONAP/USAID/FIPA.
- nejo Chosquitán, Reserva de la Biosfera Maya, Petén, Guatemala. Sociedad Civil Laborantes del Bosque. 20 p.
- Ministerio de Gobernación, 2007. Viceministerio de Seguridad para Petén (Ex), Estrategia de Seguridad Ambiental de la Zona de Uso Múltiple de la Reserva de Biosfera Maya.
- Prisma, 2004. El Caso de la Asociación de Comunidades Forestales del Peten. Análisis de Contexto. Programa Salvadoreño de Investigación y Medio Ambiente. 60 p. [http://www.uvm.edu/~agroecol/Gomez&Mendez\\_Assoc\\_Com\\_Forest\\_Peten.pdf](http://www.uvm.edu/~agroecol/Gomez&Mendez_Assoc_Com_Forest_Peten.pdf)
- Radachowsky, J. 2002. Endemismo en la Selva Maya. WCS, CONAP, UDAI, FIPA.
- Samayoa, Omar. 2011. Draft Agents & Drivers Report. Unpublished manuscript. Rainforest Alliance. Guatemala City. September, 2010. Informe sobre Análisis de Agentes y Causas de Deforestación en Tierras Bajas del Petén-Samayoa-09-2010.pdf
- SAID, 2006a. FRAME. El rol de los productos naturales en el desarrollo rural, el alivio a la pobreza y gobernabilidad en el manejo del recurso. El caso de la palma de xate (*chamaedorea* spp.) en la Región de Petén, Guatemala. IRG, Washington, DC.
- [http://eonegociosagricolas.com/enf/files/El\\_rol\\_de\\_los\\_productos\\_naturales\\_en\\_el\\_Desarrollo.pdf](http://eonegociosagricolas.com/enf/files/El_rol_de_los_productos_naturales_en_el_Desarrollo.pdf)
- USAID/CONAP, 2002. Estrategia para el Monitoreo Biológico del Programa Ambiental USAID 2001 – 2004. RBM, Guatemala.

- USAID, 2002. Estrategia Para el Manejo del Area de Alta Importancia Biológica con Aplicación en el Parque Nacional Sierra del Lacandon Reserva de la Biosfera Maya. CONAP, Fundación Defensores de la Naturaleza. Guatemala.
- WCS, 2011. Abundancia de Jaguares y presas asociadas al fototrampeo en el sector oeste del Parque Nacional Mirador – Rio Azul Reserva de la Biosfera Maya. WCS-Programa para Guatemala.
- WCS, 2010. Abundancia de Jaguares en el Parque Nacional Tikal Reserva de la Biosfera Maya <http://www.caftadr-environment.org/outreach/publications/Abundancia%20Biosfera.pdf>
- Control natal en el mundo: <http://www.medilegis.com/bancoconocimiento/R/RM49-CI-ControlNatal/RM49-CI-ControlNatal.asp> pg 1)
- Constitución política de la república de Guatemala. [http://www.oas.org/juridico/MLA/sp/gtm/sp\\_gtm-int-text-const.pdf](http://www.oas.org/juridico/MLA/sp/gtm/sp_gtm-int-text-const.pdf)
- Decreto Legislativo 4-89 Ley de áreas protegidas. [http://www.infoiarna.org.gt/media/file/areas/agua/legislacion/Ley\\_Areas%20protegidas.pdf](http://www.infoiarna.org.gt/media/file/areas/agua/legislacion/Ley_Areas%20protegidas.pdf)
- Acuerdo Gubernativo 759-90 Reglamentó de la Ley de Áreas Protegidas. [http://www.infoiarna.org.gt/media/file/areas/biodiversidad/legislacion/Reglamento\\_leyAP.pdf](http://www.infoiarna.org.gt/media/file/areas/biodiversidad/legislacion/Reglamento_leyAP.pdf)
- Decreto Legislativo 5-90: creación de la Reserva de la Biósfera maya . [http://www.marn.gob.gt/sub/portal\\_rbm/documentos/Decreto5-90RBM.pdf](http://www.marn.gob.gt/sub/portal_rbm/documentos/Decreto5-90RBM.pdf)
- Acuerdo gubernativo 431-2007. Reglamento de evaluación, control y seguimiento ambiental MARN [http://www.marn.gob.gt/sub/portal\\_sao/documents/leyes/gub-431-2007.pdf](http://www.marn.gob.gt/sub/portal_sao/documents/leyes/gub-431-2007.pdf)
- Decreto 1441 Código de trabajo de Guatemala. [http://www.sice.oas.org/investment/NatLeg/GTM/Trabajo\\_s.pdf](http://www.sice.oas.org/investment/NatLeg/GTM/Trabajo_s.pdf)
- Ley forestal de Guatemala decreto 101-96 [http://www.sice.oas.org/investment/NatLeg/GTM/Forestal\\_s.pdf](http://www.sice.oas.org/investment/NatLeg/GTM/Forestal_s.pdf)
- Índice de Desarrollo Humano – Anexo Estadístico: [http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/HDR\\_2010\\_ES\\_Tables\\_reprint.pdf](http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/HDR_2010_ES_Tables_reprint.pdf)
- El Portal de Petén: <http://elportaldepeten.com/nuevo/content/view/355/53/>
- Estudios en la RBM. <http://www.parkswatch.org/parkprofile.php?l=spa&country=gua&park=tinp&page=ref>
- Mesa de Monitoreo Selva Maya, 2010: <http://www.selvamayamonitoreo.org/rbm.html>