

VERIFICATION 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

Project Title	Lacandón- Forest for Life REDD+ Project
Version	1
Report ID	VER CCB 20160909

Report Title	CCB Verification report Lacandón project
Client	Souh Pole Group Asset Management S.A.S
Pages	63
Date of Issue	2016-10-06
Prepared By	AENOR
Contact	Génova 6. 28004 Madrid-España. Teléfono +34 914326000, www.aenor.es
Approved By	Luis Robles Olmos
Work Carried Out By	Lead Auditor: José Luis Fuentes Auditor: Manuel García Rosell

Summary:

AENOR has carried out the verification of the project. 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 verification was to assess the conformance of information in the Monitoring and Implementation Report with the CCB Standard Third Edition.

This verification report has been submitted to the primary PP in which 6 CARs and 4 CLs were reported for CCB. However, all these issues raised during the verification 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 verification report and deems with reasonable level of assurance that the project complies with all of the verification criteria for CCB.

The project involves a multiple list of activities guided to avoid deforestation in the project area but also providing benefits in local communities and biodiversity. AENOR based on a deep desk review of documents provided by PPs during the verification process and inputs gathered during the site visits, deems the project is being implemented to reach the planned objectives. In fact, the primary target, avoiding deforestation has been achieved for the first monitoring period. The project claims emissions reductions of 411,092 tn CO₂. No leakage reported for the monitoring period.

Lots of events were carried out during the monitoring period. They are detailed in the annex III of the monitoring report. Many of them focused to train local communities, strengthen the legal status of communities in place, coordination of teams, patrolling etc. The events performed and the evidence provided confirms the net benefits in Climate, Community and Biodiversity.

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 verification results 6

2 METHODOLOGY 7

 2.1 CCBA Standard 7

 2.2 Verification Team 7

 2.3 Audit 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.....	34
3.2.5	GL 1 Climate Change Adaptation Benefits. Optional Criterion	35
3.3	Community Section	36
3.3.1	CM1 Without Project Community Scenario.....	36
3.3.2	CM2 Net Positive Community Impacts.....	38
3.3.3	CM3 Other Stakeholders Impacts	41
3.3.4	CM4 Community Impact Monitoring.....	42
3.3.5	GL2 Exceptional Community Benefits. Optional Criterion	44
3.4	Biodiversity Section	50
3.4.1	B.1 Biodiversity Without Project Scenario.....	50
3.4.2	B2. Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts.....	51
3.4.3	B3 Offsite Biodiversity Impacts.	54
3.4.4	B4 Biodiversity Impact Monitoring	55
3.4.5	GL3 Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits. Optional Criterion	56
4	VERIFICATION CONCLUSION.....	59
5	ANEXX 1: LIST OF EVIDENCE PROVIDED.....	60

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

The objective of the verification audit was to conduct an independent assessment of the project against all defined criteria as defined by the Climate Biodiversity and Community Alliance. Verification will result in a conclusion by AENOR whether the information related to the CCB benefits provided by the project implementation report activity is accurate and they have been achieved; the project has been implemented in compliance with the CCB Standard third version and the registered PDD

1.2 Scope and Criteria

The project was assessed against the CCB Standards Third Edition to determine which of the seventeen required and three optional CCB Standards criteria the project satisfies. Any potential or actual material discrepancies identified during the assessment process were resolved through the issuance of findings.

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 verification results

This report of our verification findings addresses each of the CCB criteria and indicators. For each criterion, the CCB indicators are listed along with a description of the evidence that was considered, and reference the findings from the audit when applicable. These findings can include Corrective Action Request, Clarifications and Forward Actions Requests. To carry out this final verification report all issues have to be closed. A summary of results is provided below.

	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

AENOR was engaged to assess the project's conformance to the CCB Standard. Works begun in February 2016 with site visit which represented a key source of information to verify project conditions. The MR (VCS+CCB) was uploaded for public comments from 1 April 2016 to 1 May 2016. No comments were received.

Following the steps defined in the "Rules for the Use of the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standards", after site visit the AENOR verification team performed a draft verification report with all issues (NCs, CLs, FARs) raised to the project proponent. Once all reported issues were appropriately closed, AENOR prepared the final verification report and Statement.

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 verification Gold level can be achieved by projects that meet the baseline requirements and at least one optional criterion gold level.

2.2 Verification Team

Lead Auditor: José Luis Fuentes Pérez

Auditor: Manuel García-Rosell

2.3 Audit process

The audit process of the project is based on the following stages:

- Initial Review of MR (VCS+CCB) for public comment.

- Site visit that included meetings with project team, with project field technicians and local communities.
- Review of stakeholder comments, if applicable.
- Issuance of CARs, CLs and FARs, if applicable.
- Project proponent response to CARs, CLs, and FARs
- Further document review and draft report preparation
- Technical review and approval of the draft report
- 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>Project Overview</p> <p>1 – Identify the primary Project Proponent which is responsible for the project’s design and implementation and provide contact details.</p> <p>2 – Define the project’s climate, community and biodiversity objectives.</p> <p>3 – Provide the location (country, sub-national jurisdictions(s)) and a brief overview of the basic physical and social parameters of the project.</p>	<p>No changes occurred for the verification event related to these indicators. 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 monitoring report shows the main objectives and benefits to be reached by the project. The most immediate are the creation of new jobs opportunities for local people, training, avoiding deforestation, more surveillance of forest, etc.</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>

Finding	No findings reported
---------	----------------------

<p>Project Design and boundaries</p> <p>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.</p> <p>5. Explain the process of stakeholder identification and analysis used to identify Communities, Community Groups and Other Stakeholders.</p> <p>6. List all Communities, Community Groups and Other Stakeholders identified using the process explained in G 1.5.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>9. Define the project start date and lifetime, and GHG accounting period and biodiversity and community benefits assessment period if relevant, and explain and justify any differences</p>	<p>Section 1.2 of the PD defines de boundaries of the project. No changes occurred for the monitoring period.</p> <p>Activities to achieve the objectives are being implemented in Cooperatives La Lucha, La Técnica Agropecuaria and Unión Maya Itza as well as the properties of FDN Los Naranjitos and Centro Campesino.</p> <p>According to comments received from PPs at the beginning of the process to integrate all communities within the SLNP was a objective. 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.</p> <p>During the present monitoring period the PPs carried out negotiations with communities without cooperation agreements. Dialogue and frequent reunions between communities, CONAP and FDN were reported for the period and important progresses with Manantialito, El Pital, Arroyo Yaxchilan communities have produce, but no agreements signed for this monitoring period.</p> <p>In the region, FDN identified the following groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women's Committee of Ramon • ACOFOP • Pastoral Social of Petén • Forest Monitoring Committee for Cooperative
---	---

between them. Define an implementation schedule, indicating key dates and milestones in the project's development.

- 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 thoughts over the project.

Maps are provided in the PDD and monitoring report.

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. Likewise, the table 5 in the monitoring report provides the status of the indicators defined to develop the strategies.

The strategies are the followings:

Strategy 1: Adjustment of land uses and land use rights in communities without land registry

Project activity 1: Signature and enforcement of cooperation agreements

Strategy 2: Forest protection and biodiversity programs

Project activity 2: Establishment of a program of patrols and surveillance subcommittee for each organization within the park.

Project activity 3: Workshops about fire management in the communities

Project activity 4: Program for conservation of habitats linked to endangered species and development of a plan for conservation of HCV

Strategy 3: Sustainable farming and livestock familiar management systems

Project activity 5: School of agroforestry promoters for

enhancing practices sustainable agriculture in the communities

Strategy 4: Diversification and use of communal forestry resources

Project activity 6: Identification of alternative NTFPs and market study on each case.

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 geographical location.

Project activity 8: Development of sustainable forest management plans for small holders and communities.

Project activity 9: Establishment and reinforcement of a program of micro-credits and the promotion of conservation and forest management.

Strategy 5: Improved management of the SLNP

Project activity 10: Human resources plan focusing on contracting permanent personnel (not seasonal jobs).

Strategy 6: Community dialog, education and capacitation
Project activity 11: Community empowerment and capacity building

Strategy 7: Health and welfare of communities

Project activity 12: Workshops about sexual and reproductive health in communities

Project activity 13: Workshops water and waste management

The table 5 of the monitoring report shows the current status of the different activities planned.

The project has a lifetime of 30 years starting on February 1 2012. The implementation schedule has been provided with main milestones.

Evidence	<p>PDD, implementation schedule, management plan, interviews with stakeholders, monitoring report.</p> <p>Registers of workshops, training sessions and surveillance.</p>
Findings	No findings.

<p>Risk Management and Long-term Viability</p> <p>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.</p> <p>11. Describe the measures needed and taken to maintain and enhance the climate, community and biodiversity benefits beyond the project lifetime.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>No changes were reported for these indicators during the monitoring period.</p> <p>FDN carried out an assessment of risks. The table 9 in the PD assess these risks in biophysical, socioeconomic, political, space and institutional scopes. New risks were not reported for the monitoring period.</p> <p>The positive and negative impacts were identified and measures to mitigate the negative impacts included. However, no negative impacts were reported for the present monitoring period in Climate, Community and Biodiversity benefits.</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</p>
---	---

	<p>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 22nd 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>Programmatic approach</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</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>No new instances were added during this monitoring period.</p> <p>Likewise the eligibility criteria have been defined in the PDD. The first instances keep the fulfilment with the eligibility criteria at verification.</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</p>
---	---

	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 implementation of the new activity.
Evidence	PDD, evidence used for first instance.
Findings	No findings.

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>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.</p> <p>It is allowable for different locations within the Project Zone to have different without-project land use scenarios.</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> <p>This indicator has not changed for the monitoring period.</p>
Evidence	PDD, technological annex and visit to the place
Findings	No findings

2.- Document that project benefits	According to information provided, the project benefits
---	---

<p>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.³⁴ Identify any distinct climate, community and biodiversity benefits intended for use as offsets and specify how additionality is established for each of these benefits.</p>	<p>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 cover page of the monitoring report describes the main benefits accomplished by the project during the monitoring period. These benefits are the consequences of project activities implemented such as training, patrolling, governance, new management of resources, cooperation and collaboration between parties, etc. All these activities are part of a multiple activities to achieve an objectives and they would not have implemented without the agreements between FDN, CONAP, Communities and financial resources from Institutions such as Oro Verde.</p>
<p>Evidence</p>	<p>PDD and assessment of the additionality. Risk analysis.</p> <p>Meetings between FDN and Cooperative, Oro Verde, CONAP.</p>
<p>Findings</p>	<p>No findings.</p>

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.

<p>Access to information</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Evidence provided by PPs and comments received during site visit with the communities and NGOs collaborating in the project zone allow AENOR deems that project issues have been divulgated from the beginning to the people affected in the NPSL.</p> <p>New records were provided to AENOR for the monitoring period to evidence the dissemination of information to the stakeholders such as invitation letters to assemblies,</p>
--	--

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.

minutes of meetings of the Governance Committee in June/July 2016, extraordinary committees, etc. These different documents evidence how the PPs communicate to the stakeholders the project information.

The procedure to access to information is described below and has not changed.

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

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 newsletters 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.

	<p>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. 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>
Evidence	PDD, interviews with stakeholders, minutes of meetings with governance committees, picture report, training comic.
Findings	No findings.

<p>Consultation.</p> <p>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</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>During this monitoring period, the dialogue and meetings have carried on between communities, CONAP and FDN and progress were reported with Manantialito, El Pital, Arroyo, Yaxchilan in order to reach cooperation agreements.</p> <p>A list of events is provided in the monitoring report where it is possible to check the meetings with communities, groups, etc to inform about issues related with the project.</p> <p>In this regard, FDN has been working in the project zone</p>
--	---

<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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 Committees 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, Governance Committees.</p>
<p>Findings</p>	<p>No Findings</p>

<p>Participation in decision-making and implementation</p> <p>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</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>PPs have provided to AENOR with some minutes of the Governance Committees carried out from the project start</p>
---	--

<p>sensitive manner.</p>	<p>date.</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> <p>The Governance Committee has been operative during the the monitoring period and fulfilling with its functions as defined in the project design.</p>
<p>Evidence</p>	<p>Communities agreements. Minutes of Governance Committee.</p>
<p>Findings</p>	<p>No Findings</p>

<p>Anti-Discrimination</p> <p>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.</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>These 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 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	No findings.

<p>Feedback and Grievance Redress Procedure</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The Feedback and Grievance Redress Procedure shall have three stages with reasonable time limits for each of the 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>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>For the specific monitoring period, the conflict resolution process was performed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The FDN field technician maintains constant communication (at least once a month), with the community representative. During this meeting, the representative reports any news, complaints, questions, or suggestions for project development. • The person who collects the information speaks with the REDD+ project coordinator, who is responsible for responding to comments. When additional assistance is needed, the consultant team is contacted. • Finally, the FDN field technician provides the community representative with the responses to all questions, based on the information provided by the REDD+ project coordinator. The representative is also responsible for transmitting the information to the community on communal committees. <p>During the stakeholder consultation, all the questions were about the project's progress, with the intention of verifying that the project would not be stopped. The duration of each cycle of questions and answers did not exceed one month. No other grievance occurred during the monitoring period.</p> <p>In this regard, AENOR checked during the site visit the</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>important role of the FDN field technicians as channel to receive and communicate the information to the local communities.</p>
<p>Evidence</p>	<p>Interviews, monitoring report</p>
<p>Findings</p>	<p>CAR 1</p> <p>The following information is required in section 2.7 of the VCS+CCB report: <i>Describe the implementation of the formal process for handling conflicts and grievances that arise during project planning and implementation (see G3.8-10).</i></p> <p>This information is not provided in the monitoring report.</p> <p>The CAR is closed. The monitoring report was updated. Information about the indicator G3.8 was included. The formal process for handling conflicts and grievances is in process of being implemented by the Governance Committee. Meanwhile the project is using the technicians in field and members of the Governance Committee as instruments to receive any feedback from communities and communicate to the project coordinator.</p>

<p>Worker Relations</p> <p>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</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,</p>
--	--

Communities, with special attention to women and vulnerable and/or marginalized people. Identify how training is passed on to 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

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 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.

The monitoring report provides data of some workers engaged for the monitoring period.

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

communities.	
Evidence	PDD, Regulations, contracts, training records, training planning, safety equipments, Good practices Manual
Findings	<p>Clarification 1</p> <p>Information in section 2.6 of the monitoring report is not clear regarding the achievements during the monitoring period in employment, safety, etc.</p> <p>Further information shall be provided to document the training provided to workers as well as information about implemented actions to achieve that equal opportunities were given to women and men.</p> <p>This clarification is closed as more explanations and specific data were provided in the monitoring report. Furthermore, an annex III in the monitoring report lists all events occurred during the monitoring period providing details about each event, the participants, the activities carried out and their dates. Moreover, the monitoring report even provides pictures of workshops.</p>

3.1.4 G4. Management Capacity.

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

<p>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.</p> <p>2. Document key technical skills required to implement the project successfully, including community</p>	<p>The project is led 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 exists 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</p>
--	--

<p>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.</p> <p>3. Document the financial health of the implementing organization(s). Provide assurance that the Project Proponent 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.</p>	<p>Pole).</p> <p>Special relevance for monitoring purposes is the role of CEMEC to monitor deforestation areas, fires, forest, etc. Thus, FDN keep cooperation with this Institution.</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>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.⁵⁶ 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.⁵⁷ Any proposed removal or relocation occurs only after obtaining Free, Prior and Informed Consent from the relevant Property Rights Holders.

Respect for rights to lands, territories and resources, and Free, Prior and Informed Consent.

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.

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

During the validation of the project the fulfilment with these indicators was demonstrated. No changes have occurred in the monitoring period, but interesting to highlight that a strategie of the project as commented below is the signature of cooperation agreements between the Communities and FDN/CONAP in order to guarantee the accomplishment of laws. To reach the objective the PPs have been actively working during these years to sign the agreements with some communities but the process is currently in progress.

The areas included in the project zone present diverse tenure status. The most representative are:

- Private owners organized in communities.
- Communities established prior to the creation of the SLNP on state-owned lands, with signed cooperation agreements.
- Communities established prior to the creation of the SLNP on state-owned lands, but still in process of acknowledgment by Guatemalan Government.
- Illegal settlements established irregularly that are not recognised by the Guatemalan Government.
- Land owned by the NGO Fundación Defensores de la Naturaleza (FDN) and other private owners.
- State-owned land.

AENOR has not detected overlapping or encroachments 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

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 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.

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.

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

	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>Congreso de la República. 1989. Ley de Áreas Protegidas. Guatemala.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>FPIC, Cooperation agreements, newsletter from Sierra Lacandon, PDD.</p>
Findings	No findings

Legal status	The main laws affecting to the project activities have been detailed in the PDD. AENOR checked the fulfilment of
---------------------	--

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.

7. Document that the project has approval from the appropriate authorities, including the established formal and/or traditional authorities customarily required by the Communities.

8. Demonstrate that the Project Proponent(s) has the unconditional, undisputed and unencumbered ability to 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.

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.

Community workshops were developed with the approval and advice of the following authorities working with the communities:

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 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

	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 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	Cooperation agreements, Governance Comitte functions, interviews, minutes of meetings.
Findings	No Findings.

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>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</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 verification team, the estimates were</p>
---	--

<p>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.</p> <p>The analysis of GHG emissions or removals must include carbon pools expected to increase significantly under the without-project scenario.</p>	<p>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>Evidence</p>	<p>PDD, monitoring report, 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>

3.2.2 CL2 Net Positive Climate Impacts

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

<p>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</p>	<p>The total GHG emissions inside the project area in the baseline scenario and project scenario have been calculated using the steps in the methodology and tools referenced in it.</p> <p>Audit team has checked during the verification process that these calculations have been carried out as required by methodology and tools.</p> <p>In opinion of the verification team, the calculations were</p>
---	--

<p>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.</p> <p>2. Demonstrate that the net climate impact of the project is positive. The net climate impact of the project is the 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).</p>	<p>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>The data are showed in table 20 of the monitoring report.</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 positive 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>According to the calculations, for the monitoring period the net emissions avoided due to the project implementation are 411,092 tnCO2. AENOR reproduced them and reach same results. Then, data is reliable and consistent with supported evidence.</p>
<p>Evidence</p>	<p>PDD, spreadsheet calculations.</p> <p>AENOR checked during verification 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>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.</p> <p>Where relevant, define and justify where Leakage is most likely to take place.</p> <p>2. Describe the measures taken to mitigate Leakage.</p> <p>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 in CL 2.1.</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. Data registered during the monitoring period for the climate, community and biodiversity parameters are detailed in the monitoring report.</p> <p>The PDD, the methodological annex and spreadsheets appropriately considered an estimation of leakage. This requires a desplacement leakage factor to the outside the project area. The DLF applied is 5% based on studies by FDN in exante calculations.</p> <p>For the present monitoring period leakage=0. The result is conveniently addressed in the monitoring report, section 6.3. It is an important data that ex-ante the leakage were estimated to account 7579 ha, however ex post, they resulted 3953 ha, thus, no leakage due to project activities were occurred following assumptions from methodology. This situation is relevant to achieve the benefits specially for biodiversity because involves a conservation of forest, ecosystems,etc and positive results are directly related with the legal status of the first instance involved in the project which perform all their activities under a legality framework and, of course, an increment in patrolling activities and the consideration of leakage management areas.</p> <p>In the calculations provided they were taken into consideration emissions of non-CO2 gases. They were quantified according to the methodology and associated tools and their estimation is insignificant compared to the total project benefits.</p>
<p>Evidence</p>	<p>Spreadsheets, PDD, annex, DLF report, Guatecarbon baseline information. Causes and Agents of Deforestation in National Park Sierra de Lacandón by FDN. Monitoring report.</p>

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>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.</p> <p>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.</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>The monitoring report states in its section 5.3 the climate monitoring parameters for monitoring. AENOR checked that all parameters defined in the PDD have been included and monitored. Values are reported in the excel calculations.</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, monitoring plan, monitoring report, calculations.

Findings	<p>CAR 2</p> <p>Section 5.3 of the monitoring report does not include all climate parameters to be monitored of the registered PDD.</p> <p>This CAR is closed as monitoring report was updated to provide information consistent with the registered PDD. All climate monitoring parameters were included.</p> <p>Clarification 2.</p> <p>To clarify why the total area deforested in the project area and leakage belt sum 4589 and the area for illegal settlement in the period sum 4950 ha. Provide justifications of the difference between both data.</p> <p>This clarification is closed. More justifications and data were provided in the monitoring report for “illegal settlement in the project zone and leakage belt”. In this regard, the 4950 ha does not correspond to illegal settlement occurred during the monitoring period. They respond to settlement in 2007, the confusion was resolved.</p>
----------	--

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>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.</p> <p>2. Demonstrate that current or anticipated climate changes are having or are likely to have an impact on the well-being of Communities and/</p> <p>3. Describe measures needed and taken to assist Communities and/or</p>	<p>As commented in the registered PDD and validation report climate changes have been reported in the region mainly related to rainfall regime, higher natural events, etc with direct impact in land use as they are causing fires, large drought periods or floodings, etc. All these phenomenons are commentred in both documents.</p> <p>With the project implementation, for the specific monitoring period, emissions accounting 411,092 tn CO2 were avoided due to a reduction of deforestation comparing with the ex ante situation. This is the primary target of the project, but other strategies are considered to adapt to Climate Change such as Sustainable farming and family livestock management systems & Diversification.</p>
--	---

<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>In SLNP, agroforestry systems also play an important economic role through food production, generating additional revenue from the sale of surplus goods.</p> <p>During the monitoring period, the project implemented a cumulative 33 ha of agroforestry systems in the San Juan Villa Nueva and Villa Hermosa communities. In addition, 14 environmental education and sustainable production workshops have developed and 11 agroforestry promoters have been trained. All these actions are led to adapt to Climate Change giving the communities the skills and capacities to understand the problems and providing solutions to mitigate the negative impacts. Project activities will help reduce population vulnerability to food insecurity through implementation of alternative productive activities (See Section 7 for specific measures). Furthermore, with the implementation of environmental education, sexual and health workshops, along with patrols and forest conservation, sustainable forest management will be achieved.</p> <p>The complex nature of interactions between climate change and natural resources virtually ensures that over the lifetime of the project new risks will emerge; risks that have not yet been identified and anticipated. In addition, the project ensures that new impacts of climate change that emerge over the lifetime of the project will be recognized and appropriately addressed in the project management.</p> <p>Indicators for Communities and Biodiversity have been included in the Monitoring Plan and monitored. Results are gathered in section 5 of the monitoring report.</p>
<p>Evidence</p>	<p>PDD, monitoring report, workshops, training sessions.</p>
<p>Findings</p>	<p>No Findings</p>

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>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.</p> <p>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:</p> <p>a. Areas that provide critical ecosystem services;</p> <p>b. Areas that are fundamental for the livelihoods of Communities; and</p> <p>c. Areas that are critical for the traditional cultural identity of Communities.</p> <p>Identify the areas that need to be managed to maintain or enhance the identified HCVs.</p> <p>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.</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 and 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>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>3. Demonstrate that the net well-being impacts of the project are positive for all identified Community Groups compared with their anticipated well-being</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 and collected information of the communities in order to establish a baseline related to endowments, infrastructures, etc.</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>The monitoring report provide in its table 22 the effects in some community assets determined by PPs as priority: Human Capital, social, physical and financial capital due to the project activities implemented in the monitoring period.</p> <p>The impacts in communities are positive and community status improves compared to the situation in the pre-</p>
--	---

conditions under the withoutproject land use scenario (described in CM1).

4. Demonstrate that no High Conservation Values (identified in CM1.2) are negatively affected by the project.

project scenario.

The project establishes as priority in the community scope the signature of cooperation agreements with communities in the SLNP. This implies to have a legal status over the land they occupy. For the monitoring period negotiations were open with some communities but processes were not concluded. Monitoring report gives details about it.

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.

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.

The project allows the access to the HCVs and therefore does not limit the local communities ability to use the land for their cultural needs, especially for Mayan communities. In terms of fundamental needs, the project follows an incentive-based approach to reduce the use of forest timber and non-timber resources. This implies that a) reduced benefits from not using forest resources are being (over)compensated for and b) forest resources are still available for use by locals.

The following measures have been implemented to maintain the HCVs:

- Support and implement alternative productive projects for local communities.
- Generate timber and non-timber forest management plans.
- Management and conservation of cultural sites such as Piedras Negras and El Tecolote, under supervision of the Ministry of Culture and Sports - Directorate of Cultural and Natural Heritage.

This way the PPs look for preserving the HCVs by preventing an overexploitation of resources, improving the

	<p>management of resources used and the establishment of agreements with partnerships to provide a better performance of monitoring and surveillance activities.</p> <p>To correctly carry out all the actions and achieve the expected benefits the PPs have done workshops with communities in several areas such as safety, health, environment, water management, land use, fires, etc. The monitoring report and other supporting documents provide enough details of them, data, pictures, minutes, etc.</p> <p>Apart of workshops other initiatives were performed and supported under the umbrella of the project such as the microcredit program. M.R provides data of families benefit or persons permanently engaged by the project. Definitely the monitoring report provides data of all community parameters measured. The net balance is positive.</p> <p>The compliance of the cooperation agreements is done every 5 years, then it will be reported in the next verification event.</p>
Evidence	Interviews with community groups, PDD, project rural appraisal, monitoring report, minutes, pictures, etc.
Findings	<p>CAR 3</p> <p>The monitoring report does not include in its section 5.3 all community parameters considered in the registered PDD.</p> <p>This CAR is closed. The monitoring report was updated for completing the list of parameters to be monitored.</p> <p>The monitoring report does not provide information about the impacts and effects in the livelihood assets of the project activities.</p> <p>This CAR is closed. The monitoring report displays the table 22 with data of net effects in the livelihood assets and impacts produced.</p> <p>The monitoring report does not provide monitoring information for the verification period on HCVs 5 and</p>

	<p>6.</p> <p>This CAR is closed because a table number 42 is displaying in the monitoring report showing data of monitoring carried out to HCVs. In this case, data are gathered from surveys carried out in the communities affected. This is the way planned by PPs to monitor the effectiveness of measures to maintain or enhance this conservation values.</p>
--	--

3.3.3 CM3 Other Stakeholders Impacts

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

<p>1. Identify any potential positive and negative impacts that the project activities are likely to cause on the well-being of Other Stakeholders.</p> <p>2. Describe the measures needed and taken to mitigate the negative well-being impacts on Other Stakeholders.</p> <p>3. Demonstrate that the project activities do not result in net negative impacts on the well-being of Other Stakeholders.</p>	<p>No negative impacts were addressed during the monitoring period to communities or other stakeholders.</p> <p>Before initiating a project or associated activities, a community meeting is gathered to explain the objectives and methods that are expected to achieve. This way the project looks for the approval and voluntary participation of affected people in order to accomplish a success in the activity.</p> <p>The intention of the FDN/CONAP/Oro Verde is to apply the same social initiatives to all communities living in the area to achieve global benefits in the region and avoiding displacement of groups to other areas to continue with pre-project activities. Thus, no negative impacts are foreseen for other stakeholder, but rather improve their situation in the legal scope, if applicable, or others.</p>
Evidence	PDD, project appraisal rural, interviews with stakeholders, REDD+ strategies.
Findings	No Findings

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 monitoring reports.

Section 5 lists the community parameters to be monitored. The results are publicly available on the Internet, and summaries are communicated to the Communities and Other Stakeholders through appropriate media, but currently the most effective are the Governance Committies, assemblies and workshops. Nevertheless, as FDN has extensive experience on field, they agreed with communities also disseminate progress of the project through periodic newsletter.

The monitoring plan and monitoring result are disclosed through the governance committee and workshops with communities. Minutes of January 2016 were provided to show the awareness of the validation and verification documents and their availability online for consultation.

In order to assess the effectiveness of measures taken to maintain or enhance the HCVs a survey was performed in the project zone. Results are providing in table 42 of the monitoring report.

The effectiveness of this method allows community members to write what they think about the project implementation. Moreover, FDN has an extensive track record regarding the management of community-based projects, conservation projects, and integration of socio-economic activities within protected areas alongside the monitoring of biodiversity and cultural heritage. There is

	<p>trust and good communication between the technicians of FDN and community members; therefore, there is no doubt as to the veracity of the information provided. Furthermore, the communities sometimes include technicians in community meetings and assemblies to serve as witnesses or to contribute their knowledge.</p> <p>This is an interesting method to gather the information because PPs directly get inputs from local people, direct responsible to respect and maintain the HCVs but also this way PPs convey to stakeholders that monitoring activities are being implemented in order to check the progress of the project.</p> <p>The project activities do not restrict the communities from using the natural resources within PNSL; rather, they guide and empower communities to sustainably use timber and non-timber resources.</p>
Evidence	<p>Monitoring parameters, surveys results, site visit.</p> <p>During site visit to the Piedras Negras High Conservation Place AENOR checked the cooperation with another Institution to maintain the resources in the area enhancing the monitoring and surveillance of the special conservation area.</p>
Findings	<p>CAR 4</p> <p>Section 5.3 of the monitoring report does not include all parameters to be monitored of the PDD. Farmers trained in better practices for sustainable agriculture and Communities that effectively manage to apply measures in case of non-compliance with applicable laws by any of its members are not reported.</p> <p>This CAR is closed, both parameters were included in the monitoring report with data of their evaluation.</p> <p>The monitoring report does not provide information about the evaluation carried out by the affected community groups over the benefits risks.</p> <p>This CAR is closed. Further information was included in</p>

	<p>indicator CM4.1.</p> <p>Evidence about the communication of results of monitoring activities for the monitoring period shall be provided.</p> <p>This CAR is closed, evidence about the dissemination of information of the project to the stakeholders was provided.</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>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 and biodiversity benefits.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>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.</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 and also detailed in the monitoring report.</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 rights, sustainable farming and livestock familiar management systems, diversification and use of communal forestry resources.</p> <p>The development of the project has been carried out with the voluntary participation of all communities. In addition, community monitoring plan has included indicators for assessing the short-term and long-term net positive well-being benefits for the cooperatives. The project also has developed a survey for the social indirect impacts that will</p>
---	--

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 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

be presented in the next monitoring report. The survey is attached in the monitoring report (annex 1).

Unión Maya Itza, La Lucha and La Técnica Agropecuaria Cooperatives, private properties within the park, and Pozo Azul, Villa Hermosa, and San Juan Villanueva communities that currently have cooperation agreements with CONAP defined activities focused on conservation, recovery and sustainable use of natural resources.

The monitoring report provides a faithful development of the social activities undertaken during the monitoring period. All of them with a clear impact in well being of communities as they are leaded to generate more incomes, more knowledge of persons, more safety, etc. the initiatives were carried out to a high variety of groups.

Some of them are the following: establishment of agroforestry systems with species such as Ramon and Allspice. Development of legal instruments to plan the sustainable management of non-timber forest resources. Improvement of equipment and training for the post-harvest management of Ramon seed. Just the planning of these activities involves an improvement compared with the pre project situation.

On the other hand, risks for participants in the projects were treated in the PRA as AENOR checked at validation.

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

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 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

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 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.

The monitoring report details information of visits negotiation events with the communities during the monitoring period and results.

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

Smallholders/Community Members, and relevant local organizations or institutions, to participate effectively and actively in project design, implementation and management.

as possible in the design of initiatives and to prevent vulnerable community members from being negatively affected by the project.

As commented above the project generates net benefits in all groups included the women group. 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. Data are provided in the monitoring report.

Regrading this vulnerable group, 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 Communities or group showing their role in the project.

The design and implementation of benefits sharing mechanism is under development. The governance committee, which involved all project proponents, agrees that the distribution of benefits should provide effective incentives for REDD+ actions and create incentives to change behavior of forest deforestation and degradation. Meeting minutes were provided to AENOR.

The committee has agreed that the Benefits Distribution Mechanism is through a structured program and FDN will present the first proposal document taking into consideration the suggestions of the project partners.

The governance committee meets periodically to evaluate the process and progress of the project and the validation and verification phase. The community representative participating in the governance committee are the

responsible to share all information and to involve the community in the decisions. According to the minutes of meeting all community representative are aware and have knowledge about the current situation of the REDD+ project and potential benefits in monetary

Therefore, 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). This Committee is the instrument for planning the distribution of 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 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. Likewise, the communities have the opportunity to assess, to evaluate the impacts of the project activities thorough surveys that PPs provides them to pick their feedback.

The Project Proponents are directly engaging the local community to develop local capacity in the design, implementation and ongoing management of the project. It is important to note that the project is working to build local capacity within all families, including women and marginalized families.

More examples of these activities boosted by the project occur in the Ramon process where a Women's Committee in La Lucha is in charge of the harvest process and post-sale process. This has generated job opportunities for women, more incomes for families and a better

	<p>management of the product. In the case of the Community Tourism Group in La Técnica Agropecuaria Cooperative, women organize and provide tourist services with the support of ACOFOP. Among the project's achievements are training women in cooking and handling of food and beverages, training community guides, experiential tourism and new local jobs (boat services).</p> <p>These initiatives are supported by training sessions through workshops. In the monitoring period, fourteen (14) workshops have been developed on environmental education and sustainable production, and twenty (20) workshops on forest fires management were developed in San Juan Villa Nueva, Poza Azul, Pital, Villa Hermosa, Asentamiento La Revancha, UMI, La Lucha, Nueva Jerusalem II, and Military detachment. There were thirty-one (31) lectures on family planning. Twenty (20) women have benefitted from the microcredit program in 2011 – 2012 (first phase), and thirteen became beneficiaries in 2012 during the second phase (seven women and six men – second phase). Eleven community members have been trained as agroforestry promoters and will help to empower their communities.</p> <p>Therefore, these are directly benefits from the projects activities that impacts directly in well being of communities due to new jobs generated, new incomes, new skills for people, new responsibilities and new roles for vulnerable groups, etc. In opinion of AENOR these activities are a clear net positive benefits compared the without project scenario.</p>
Evidence	Interviews, Cooperation agreements, Minutes of Governance Committees, Sustainable Livelihood Approach, records of workshops, surveys from communities, training records,...
Findings	<p>Clarification 3</p> <p>Further information shall be provided in the monitoring report to assess the fulfilment of the project with indicators GL2.6 to GL2.9.</p> <p>The clarification is closed. The monitoring report was</p>

	<p>strengthened. Further information was provided about the benefits sharing mechanism, information communication, governance and implementation structures, capacities of stakeholders, etc.</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>1. Describe biodiversity within the Project Zone at the start of the project and threats to that biodiversity, using appropriate methodologies.</p> <p>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:</p> <p>a. Globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values;</p> <p>i. protected areas</p> <p>ii. threatened species</p> <p>iii. endemic species</p> <p>iv. areas that support significant concentrations of a species during any time in their lifecycle.</p> <p>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;</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>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>c. Threatened or rare ecosystems.112</p> <p>Identify the areas that need to be managed to maintain or enhance the identified HCVs.</p> <p>3. Describe how the without-project land use scenario would affect biodiversity conditions in the Project Zone.</p>	
<p>Evidence</p>	<p>PDD and evidence mentioned in sections 1.3.6 to 1.3.8</p>
<p>Findings</p>	<p>No findings.</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>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 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.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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</p>	<p>As commented in Climate section, the project has avoided the emissions of 411,092 tn CO₂ during the monitoring period due to a reduction of deforestation compared with the baseline scenario. This involves to keep the forest and accordingly to maintain or enhance the conditions for biodiversity and the habitat of the endangered and vulnerable species. This is the first positive impact of the project compared to the without project scenario.</p> <p>To monitor the biodiversity and the three main indicators, the project uses the Camera Trap Method.</p> <p>The main wildlife monitored by camera traps are jaguar (<i>Panthera onca</i>), tapir (<i>Tapirus bairdii</i>) and white-lipped peccary (<i>Tayassu pecari</i>). These species are under constant threat and listed on IUCN Red List. The monitoring of these species implicitly provides information of the state of the ecosystems where they live. These species are closely associated with native and primary forest; therefore; conservation strategies are developed to protect the forest and the threatened species.</p> <p>The table 43 of the monitoring report provides an</p>
---	---

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.

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.

assessment of the impacts provoked by the project activities over the natural capital. No negative impacts were reported for the monitoring period.

The monitoring plan to evaluate the biodiversity benefits establishes a list of biodiversity parameters. Values are provided in section 5 of the monitoring report. The records of threatened wildlife show the presence of 39 jaguars, 114 tapirs and 123 white-lipped peccaries.

Therefore, the Conservation of threatened species—those with identified natural high conservation value (HCV1)—lies at the core of the project's activities. The recovery of ecological niches for endemic, vulnerable or threatened species is favored by project activities and the HCVs are not expected to be negatively affected by the project.

Apart from this method, for monitoring other relevant parameters in the project zone such as forest fires and forest cover which directly affect to biodiversity, FDN is supported by CEMEC through the analysis of satellite images.

Definitely, the net impacts over the project zone are positive compared with the pre-project 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 acknowledge 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. The monitoring report provides data about patrolling activities carried out during the monitoring period.

The project uses species during its agricultural and forestry activities. Invasive species have not been used. Likewise, the activities envisioned by this project do not foresee the use of non-native species or Genetically Modified

	<p>Organisms (GMOs). Seeds collected in the project area are used to establish tree nurseries, as described in B2.6.</p> <p>The list of species to be used in the project is the following: <i>Cedrela odorata</i>, <i>Swietenia macrophylla</i>, <i>Brosimum alicastrum</i>, <i>Theobroma cacao</i>, <i>Pimenta dioica</i>.</p> <p>The project has had a positive impact on biodiversity outside the project area. No leakage were reported in the monitoring period, thus, the deforestation was also reduced outside the project area.</p> <p>For the monitoring period the species used were native and agro-ecological practices were put in use, then, it is expected reducing the use of fertilizers or pesticides.</p> <p>In order to achieve a friendly use of agrochemical products the PPs carried out different educational sessions to promote the responsible and appropriate use of pesticides, fertilizers.</p> <p>Regarding management of wastes, for the monitoring period the PPs carried out several environmental meetings to awareness to the communities about this output from project activities. Communities have created little landfills to deposit wastes as a first step.</p>
Evidence	<p>Monitoring report, spreadsheet calculations, GIS package, 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.</p>
Findings	<p>CAR 5</p> <p>The monitoring report does not provide information about the effects and impacts of project activities in the biodiversity assets identified in the PDD.</p> <p>The CAR is closed, the table 43 was included in the</p>

	<p>monitoring report providing the effects and impacts on biodiversity assets.</p> <p>The monitoring report does not provide information about monitoring of the HCV1.</p> <p>This CAR is closed. The monitoring report was updated and further information was included in section 8.1.1.</p> <p>Clarification 4</p> <p>Further information shall be provided for indicators B2.5 to 9 with specific information for the specific monitoring period.</p> <p>The clarification is closed. The monitoring report was enriched with more information about the consideration of invasives species in the project, non native species, GMOs, fertilizers, pesticides and wastes.</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>1. Identify potential negative impacts on biodiversity that the project activities are likely to cause outside the Project Zone.</p> <p>2. Describe the measures needed and taken to mitigate these negative impacts on biodiversity outside the Project Zone.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>A potential negative impact on biodiversity that the project activities could cause outside the project area is an increase of illegal activities such as logging, poaching, etc displaced from the project area.</p> <p>No leakage outside the project area is reported. The main measure taken by PPs to mitigate potential negative impacts on biodiversity is the increase of patrolling activities in the project zone. To guarantee an efficient surveillance of the area the PPs looked for the collaboration of the Institutions presented in the SLNP.</p> <p>Likewise, the PPs want to export some of the project activities to the outside communities such as reforestations, enrichment activities, agroforestry activities, etc to change the pre-existing land use models and behaviours.</p> <p>Definitely, the impacts on biodiversity in the project zone are net positive as a result of the project activity. Deforestation has been avoided for the monitoring period in a number of hectares detailed in the monitoring report.</p>
--	--

	This involves the conservation of ecosystems in these areas. Apart from this principal effect from the project other initiatives were implemented to maintain or enhance the biodiversity such as training, better management of natural resources, etc. All of them report a net positive impact.
Evidence	Monitoring report, records of monitoring parameters.
Findings	No findings.

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>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).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Section 5 of the monitoring report provides the Biodiversity parameters to be monitored, including parameters to assess the HCVs. Data of parameters monitored is included in the monitoring report.</p> <p>The monitoring of the community and biodiversity parameters provides to the PPs with data to be comparable over the time which allow them to make conclusions about the effectiveness of measures.</p> <p>To disseminate the monitoring plan and results of the monitoring and other issues related to the project the PPs used the Governance Committee. For the monitoring period verified a Committee was carried out in January 2016. The minutes of the meetings were provided to AENOR. The validation and verification of the project by a VVB were matters included. Furthermore, documents were put on line to be consulted by stakeholders. PPs also use the workshops to inform about the latest progress</p>
--	---

Evidence	Minutes of Governance Committee, monitoring plan, monitoring results.
Findings	<p>CAR 6</p> <p>The list of biodiversity parameters to be monitored is incomplete in section 5.3 of the monitoring report. Habitat for jaguar, hectares dedicated to agroforestry systems and displaying of illegal activities are not considered.</p> <p>The CAR is closed, these parameters were included and data about their monitoring also provided.</p>

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>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:</p> <p>1.1 Vulnerability</p> <p>Regular occurrence of a globally threatened species (according to the IUCN Red List) at the site:</p> <p>a. Critically Endangered (CR) and Endangered (EN) species - presence of</p>	<p>The project zone includes a site of high biodiversity conservation priority due to its vulnerability.</p> <p>The monitoring report provides in table 61 a red list from IUCN of the species identified as Vulnerable, Endangered or Critically Endangered and presence in the SLNP.</p> <p>The Key Biodiversity Area is defined in the SLNP by the “trigger species” selected by PPs: The near threatened Jaguar (<i>Panthera onca</i>), the largest feline in Latin America and part of the Guatemalan culture for years; the endangered Tapir (<i>Tapirus bairdii</i>), largest land mammal in the Neotropics and the only living representative of perissodactyla order. It is a specie considered nationally endangered and throughout its range, and the vulnerable White-lipped Pecari (<i>Tayassu pecari</i>), is threatened due to strong illegal hunting. 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</p>
--	--

at least a single individual; or

b. Vulnerable species (VU) - presence of at least 30 individuals or 10 pairs.

OR

1.2 Irreplaceability

A minimum proportion of a species' global population present at the site at any stage of the species' lifecycle according to the following thresholds:

a. Restricted-range species - species with a global range less than 50,000 km² and 5% of global population at the site; or

b. Species with large but clumped distributions - 5% of the global population at the site; or

c. Globally significant congregations - 1% of the global population seasonally at the site;

or

d. Globally significant source populations - 1% of the global population at the site.

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.

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

threatened CITES and List of Threatened Species of the CONAP.

During the monitoring period 2012-2014 were identified the presence of jaguar, tapir and white-lipped peccary in the project area. Data of monitoring are provided in the monitoring report.

These three species require large tracts of continuous forest to maintain viable populations over time, so generating mechanisms or tools for conservation habitat, are protecting other species that share the same habitat type, allowing there a balance of the ecosystem.

Measures taken are the same than those for the High Conservation Value 1: Biodiversity and threatened species:

- Annual monitoring of endangered wildlife and indicator of stable ecosystems.
- Register of other species in the project zone through camera-traps sampling.
- Patrols conducted to avoid invasions.
- Awareness and workshops on forest fires.
- Control over illegal extraction of natural resources.
- Generate research and wildlife management threatened.

The data of the trigger species is provided in the monitoring report. 39 jaguars, 114 tapirs and 123 peccaries were observed by camera traps during the monitoring period.

<p>identifies threats to Trigger species and activities to address them.</p> <p>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.</p>	
<p>Evidence</p>	<p>Monitoring report, IUCN List.</p>
<p>Findings</p>	<p>No findings.</p>

4 VERIFICATION CONCLUSION

The review and cross-check of explanations and justifications in the P.I.R dated on 27 September 2016 with sources detailed in the report have provided AENOR with sufficient evidence to determine the accomplishment of all stated criteria of the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standard v.3. The summary of Climate, Community and Biodiversity benefits generated by the project for the present monitoring report included on the cover page of the monitoring report is accurate.

In opinion of AENOR, the project implementation meets all relevant requirements for the CCB Standards third edition, including Climate, Community and Biodiversity exceptional benefits. Hence, AENOR considers the project implementation in accordance with the CCB Standards and with Gold Level, verified.

Madrid, 2016-10-06

Luis Robles Olmos



Authorized person

José Luis Fuentes



Lead auditor

5 ANEXX 1: LIST OF EVIDENCE PROVIDED.

The present list refers to evidence used for the CCB verification but also VCS.

- Signed Act of Governance Committee in January 2016
- Attendance Records of meeting with COCODES.
- Surveys results to assess HCVs
- Minutes of meetings of Governance Committee
- Sampling methodology for monitoring the trigger species.
- Videos from camera traps.
- Minutes of training sessions, workshops
- GIS package
- Spreadsheet calculation
- Risk Report
- Monitoring report
- Reports of illegal activities.
- Patrolling information including activity, area, target, date, results, teams, products confiscated, if applicable.
- Pictures package from environmental training, enrichment activities, REDD events, coordination workshops, reforestation activities, health workshops, fires workshops.
- Fires report.
- Monitoring Data base of community and biodiversity.
- 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
- 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
- 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
- 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
- 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
- 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
- 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
- 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/prenden-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/gpoglulucf/gpoglulucf.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.oerverde.de/>
- OroVerde international projects. Available at <http://www.oerverde.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
- 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/leyesconveniosyacuerdos/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/WBTEXT/29402/73185/S95GTM01.htm>
- Available at: 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 1Km² 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