

# **TAP Review of the R-Package submitted by Guatemala<sup>1</sup>**

**February 2018**

---

<sup>1</sup> This TAP Expert Review consisted of a desk study of Guatemala's R-package report and of review of additional documentation on Guatemala's REDD+ readiness process. The review was carried out by Simon Rietbergen, independent TAP Expert, from February 12<sup>th</sup> to 26<sup>th</sup> 2018.

## Table of Contents

<b>CORE TASKS OF THE TAP EXPERT REVIEW .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>METHODS APPLIED FOR THE TAP EXPERT REVIEW .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>TAP REVIEW PART A: REVIEW OF THE SELF-ASSESSMENT PROCESS AND THE DOCUMENTATION .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>TAP REVIEW PART B: SUMMARY OF THE REDD+ PROCESSES – STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE R-PACKAGE AS HIGHLIGHTED BY GUATEMALA’S SELF-ASSESSMENT.....</b>	<b>12</b>
COMPONENT 1: READINESS, ORGANIZATION AND CONSULTATION.....	14
COMPONENT 2: REDD+ STRATEGY PREPARATION .....	<del>17</del> 18
COMPONENT 3: REFERENCE LEVELS/EMISSION REFERENCE LEVELS (CRITERIA 26-28, READINESS SCORE: YELLOW) .....	24
COMPONENT 4: MONITORING SYSTEMS FOR FORESTS AND SAFEGUARDS .....	26
<b>TAP REVIEW PART C: SUMMARY ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE PC.....</b>	<b>28</b>

## Core Tasks of the TAP Expert Review

1. The present document contains the independent review by the Technical Advisory Panel (TAP) of the Self-Assessment Process of the R-Package<sup>2</sup> undertaken by Guatemala through a participatory multi-stakeholder consultation process. The purpose of the review is to assess both progress and achievements of REDD+ Readiness in the country, as well as the remaining challenges (if any) that will need to be addressed to make the transition from Readiness to implementation of performance-based REDD+ activities.
2. The TAP-review is a background document for the Participants Committee (PC) in its decision-making process on the endorsement of the R-Package. The endorsement of the R-Package is a prerequisite for the formal submission of Guatemala's Emissions Reduction Program (ERP) to the PC. Guatemala's ER Program is planned for implementation at national level, and distinguishes five REDD+ regions, each with different biophysical and socioeconomic contexts, and drivers of deforestation and forest degradation.<sup>3</sup> According to Guatemala's September 2014, ER-PIN, the ERP plans to deliver nearly 21 million tCO<sub>2</sub>eq of emissions reductions to the FCPF Carbon Fund over a five-year period.<sup>4</sup>

## Methods Applied for the TAP Expert Review

3. This TAP Expert Review of the multi-stakeholder self-assessment process of REDD+ in Guatemala follows the FCPF R-Package Assessment Framework guide and benefits from the experience gained with a number of previous reviews that were done since the first was completed in DR Congo in April 2015. The TORs for the current TAP expert review are as follows:
  - Perform an independent review of Guatemala's self-evaluation of progress in REDD+ Readiness, using the methodological framework of the FCPF Readiness Assessment Framework for consistency;
  - Review Guatemala's documentation of stakeholders' self-assessment, including the process that was used for the self-assessment and the reported outcome;
  - Review key outputs (and the documents that underpin these) referenced in the R-Package, including documents pertaining to the national REDD+ strategy, the Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) and Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), reference

---

<sup>2</sup> The purpose of the R-Package is threefold: (i) Provide an opportunity to REDD Country Participants to self-assess the progress on REDD+ implementation; (ii) Demonstrate a REDD Country Participant's commitment to REDD+ Readiness; and (iii) Generate feedback and guidance to REDD Country Participants through a national multi-stakeholder self-assessment and Participants' Committee (PC) assessment processes (FCPF Readiness Assessment Framework guide June 2013).

<sup>3</sup> Guatemala's September 2014 ER Program Idea Note can be accessed through: <https://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/sites/fcp/files/2014/september/Guatemala%20ER-PIN%20Version%20Sept%202014.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> Originally planned for 2016-2020

- levels and forest monitoring, and national institutional structures;
  - Provide constructive and targeted feedback, highlighting strengths and weaknesses in subcomponents, and propose actions going forward.
4. To perform this task, a simple methodology has been applied which consists of the following steps:
    - Step A: Review the self-assessment process of REDD+ Readiness based on Guatemala's R-package report and supporting documentation. Box 1 below provides the outline of Guatemala's R-package report.
    - Step B: Review of the results from the multi-stakeholder R-Package self-assessment process, based on the same report.
    - Step C: Assess what still needs to be done to further the readiness process.
  5. The purpose of the TAP's expert review is not to second-guess the outcomes of the country's self-assessment, as this is based on a comprehensive multi-stakeholder process that was guided by the FCPF's readiness assessment framework. The review should rather focus on determining whether a due process and approach was followed while performing the self-assessment, and provide constructive feedback to the FCPF Participants Committee.

---

***Box 1: Outline of Guatemala's R-Package Report:***  
**"Readiness Package for REDD+ in Guatemala – To be presented to the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF)"**

1. INTRODUCTION
2. SUMMARY OF THE PREPARATION PROCESS OF REDD+
  - 2.1 COMPONENT 1: READINESS ORGANIZATION AND CONSULTATION
    - 2.1.1 Subcomponent 1a: National REDD+ Management Arrangements
    - 2.1.2 Subcomponent 1b: Consultation, participation and outreach
  - 2.2 COMPONENT 2: REDD+ Strategy Preparation
    - 2.2.1 Subcomponent 2a: Assessment of Land Use, Land-Use Change Drivers, Forest Law, Policy and Governance
    - 2.2.2 Subcomponent 2b: REDD+ Strategy options
    - 2.2.3 Subcomponent 2c: Implementation Framework
    - 2.2.4 Subcomponent 2d: Social and Environmental Impacts
  - 2.3 COMPONENT 3: Reference Emissions Level/Reference Levels (REL/RL)
  - 2.4 COMPONENT 4: Monitoring Systems for Forests and Safeguards
    - 2.4.1 Subcomponent 4a: National Forest Monitoring System
    - 2.4.2 Subcomponent 4b: Information System for Multiple Benefits, Other

## Impacts, Governance and Safeguards

### 3. METHODOLOGY FOR PARTICIPATORY SELF-ASSESSMENT OF THE ENDDBG PREPARATION PROCESS

### 4. RESULTS OF THE PARTICIPATORY SELF-ASSESSMENT

#### 4.1 Scope and scale

#### 4.2 Framework

#### 4.3 Processes

##### 4.3.1 Preparing for the Assessment

##### 4.3.2 Conducting the Assessment

##### 4.3.3 Communicating the Assessment Outcome

## REFERENCES

## ANNEXES:

**Annex 1:** REDD+ documents available on the website of the Guatemala Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources  
[http://www.marn.gob.gt/s/redd\\_/paginas/Paquete\\_de\\_preparacin](http://www.marn.gob.gt/s/redd_/paginas/Paquete_de_preparacin)

**Annex 2:** List of workshops and meetings that served as the basis for multi-sector participation in the Dialogue and Participation process for the construction of the ENDDBG

**Annex 3:** Adequacy of Criteria and Diagnostic Questions for Multi-stakeholder Participatory Self-Assessment

**Annex 3 (bis):** Agenda of the Participatory Self-Evaluation Workshop held on January 17, 2018.

**Annex 4:** List of Participants to the Participatory Self-Evaluation Workshop held on January 17, 2018.

**Annex 5:** Commitments to be executed in 2018 of the first readiness phase currently executed by the Ministry of Environment (US\$3.8 million)

---

## TAP Review Part A: Review of the Self-Assessment Process and the Documentation

*This part of the TAP report provides feedback on the multi-stakeholder self-assessment process, as documented in the R-package report.*

5. Self-Assessment process conducted according to the R-Package guidelines. The multi-stakeholder consultation process for the self-assessment of Guatemala's REDD+ Readiness culminated in a single one-day participatory multi-stakeholder workshop, held on January 17th, 2018. The process was funded by FCPF and the national budget. The organization chosen to conduct the self-assessment process was Geotecnologica de Centroamerica, S.A., an independent consultancy firm. Preparatory work included organization of the self-assessment team and identification of facilitators, sponsors and stakeholders to be consulted.
6. The preparatory work for the self-assessment involved the following steps: (i) send official invitations to participate in the self-assessment workshop to the Focal Points of each of the stakeholders identified in the General Plan for Dialogue and Participation<sup>5</sup>, expressing a preference for representatives who had already been involved in the REDD+ Readiness process, but leaving the final choice to the respective stakeholders<sup>6</sup>; (ii) make available materials from the National REDD+ Strategy (ENDDBG) preparation process to any interested stakeholders; (iii) prepare a presentation (by the Ministry of the Environment) on the chronology and achievements of the ENDDBG preparation process so far; (iv) prepare a presentation (by the independent facilitators) on the self-assessment methodology; and (v) adapt the language of the FCPF Readiness Assessment Framework evaluation criteria and guiding questions to the national context and to the audience, without changing the substantive content of the criteria and questions.<sup>7</sup>
7. There was a great diversity of stakeholders represented at the self-assessment workshop. The 50 participants included representatives from indigenous peoples, local communities and organizations that influence forest management at a local level, as well as Municipalities (through their Municipal Forestry Offices and/or Municipal Management Units (UGAM) and Municipal Women's Offices (OMM), Commonwealths (grouped municipalities), representatives of the different levels of the Development Councils Systems (SISCODE), groups of women and young people who manage or influence forest management, NGOs and community forestry networks, Universities and research institutions, Private companies and

---

<sup>5</sup> The Spanish version of the General Plan for Dialogue and Participation is available at <http://www.marn.gob.gt/Multimedios/9625.pdf>

<sup>6</sup> This led to the participation of several stakeholder representatives who had had little previous exposure to REDD+ activities and consultations, and who tended to attribute lower REDD+ Readiness scores than participants who had been actively involved, as discussed below.

<sup>7</sup> The Spanish language version of the criteria and questions used at the Self-Assessment workshop is in Annex 3 of the R-Package report.

Government Institutions. Forty-three (43) percent of participants were women, and fifty-seven (57) percent men.<sup>8</sup>

8. The assessment was conducted in the form of working group discussions, with participants divided into five working groups based on their knowledge of the different REDD+ Readiness components and subcomponents. Each group chose its own rapporteur and secretary to ensure effective restitution of working group conclusions and readiness scores to the self-assessment workshop plenary. Apart from the REDD+ Readiness (color) scores, the working groups were also asked to provide suggestions for improvement of the REDD+ Readiness process, and to comment on how gender and indigenous peoples' issues had been addressed.<sup>9</sup> Furthermore, rapporteurs were asked to prioritize their suggestions for improvement, in order to make the subsequent plenary discussions more focused. During the plenary, a single REDD+ Readiness score for each criterion and sub-component was produced and a coherent set of necessary improvements of the REDD Readiness process agreed. These improvements are well-summarized in the R-package report, under each sub-component and also at the end of chapter 4 (pp. 114-15). Initially, some of the criteria were not evaluated during the self-assessment workshop, because the stakeholders indicated that they did not know the final versions of the documents concerned. Therefore, after the workshop, the Ministry of the Environment sent the documents to the workshop participants, asking them to consult the document and provide their color scores.<sup>10</sup>
9. Guatemala's decision to hold just one self-assessment workshop, including many (self-selected) participants who had not been actively engaged in the REDD+ Readiness process so far, led to relatively low Readiness scores – in many cases lower than the scores achieved at the REDD+ Mid-Term Review in 2016.<sup>11</sup> In addition, the fact that the self-assessment workshop was completed in a single day meant there was no time for in-depth presentations followed by question and answer sessions on the progress achieved in each of the sub-components.<sup>12</sup> In the opinion of the TAP

---

<sup>8</sup> The detailed list of participants, including their institutional affiliations, is given in Annex 4 of the R-Package report.

<sup>9</sup> Guatemala's roadmap for the incorporation of Gender Considerations in the National REDD+ Process is available at:  
[http://www.marn.gob.gt/s/redd\\_/paginas/Ruta\\_de\\_trabajo\\_para\\_la\\_incorporacin\\_de\\_consideraciones\\_de\\_gnero\\_en\\_el\\_proceso\\_nacional\\_REDD\\_de\\_Guatemala](http://www.marn.gob.gt/s/redd_/paginas/Ruta_de_trabajo_para_la_incorporacin_de_consideraciones_de_gnero_en_el_proceso_nacional_REDD_de_Guatemala)

<sup>10</sup> As explained in the R-Package report, 6 out of the 34 criteria were scored after the workshop: 13-15, 17-18 and 22.

<sup>11</sup> For some sub-components, the scores attributed appeared to be somewhat incongruous, e.g. criterion 23, analysis of social and environmental safeguard issues, was scored red (not yet demonstrating progress), whereas criterion 25, the environmental and social management framework, was scored green (significant progress).

<sup>12</sup> In most countries that have produced an R-package report so far, there was more than one multi-stakeholder workshop, and/or the self-assessment workshop itself lasted longer than one day – providing a better opportunity for stakeholders to familiarize themselves with the details of REDD+ Readiness results. Also, the overwhelming majority of stakeholder representatives in

reviewer, most of these lower Readiness scores are probably more indicative of the unfamiliarity of many self-assessment workshop participants with REDD+, rather than any definite sign of “back-sliding” since the 2016 Mid-Term Review.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: the FCPF Readiness Assessment Framework was used conscientiously during the self-assessment process, with criteria and questions reworded where necessary to take account of Guatemala’s national circumstances and avoid confusion of stakeholders who might be unfamiliar with certain technical terms. A consultancy firm was hired as the facilitator for the self-assessment workshop, guaranteeing the independence of the self-assessment process: a recognized good practice. Due to a variety of factors, the Readiness scores attributed by the self-assessment workshop were relatively low – in many cases lower than the scores achieved at the REDD+ Mid-Term Review in 2016. In the opinion of the TAP reviewer, most of these lower Readiness scores can be explained by the unfamiliarity of many self-assessment workshop participants with REDD+, in combination with the limited time available during the workshop to share detailed information on progress achieved in each of the sub-components. Nevertheless, the color scores produced by the self-assessment workshop constitute a valuable signal to the authorities that a lot of work remains to be done to bring all the relevant stakeholders nationwide up to speed with the REDD+ Readiness process, and with their resulting responsibilities and rights during the REDD+ implementation phase. This is especially important in the case of Guatemala, which intends to submit a national-level Emissions Reduction Program to the FCPF Carbon Fund. The necessary improvements to the REDD+ Readiness process proposed during the multi-stakeholder self-assessment workshop are well-summarized in the R-Package report. They will also be helpful as Guatemala moves towards completion of the REDD+ Readiness phase.*

**10. Facilitation of the self-assessment process.** The R-Package report provides sufficient detail on the stakeholder workshop, including not just on the facilitation at the workshop itself but also on the process for identifying workshop participants, through self-selection. This is a recognized good practice, as it empowers the stakeholders and ensures that the participants who attend the workshop are truly representative of their stakeholder groups. The consultation process appears to have been well-structured, with the dividing up of the participants into five working groups, enabling participants to contribute to the subjects they were most familiar with, and allowing sufficient time for in-depth discussion before reporting back to the plenary. The self-assessment workshop started with a detailed presentation on REDD+ progress, though for quite a few participants, who had not been actively involved in REDD+ prior to the self-assessment workshop, it may have been difficult to assimilate all the new – and sometimes quite technical – information. Guatemala’s decision to recruit an independent consultancy firm with the facilitation of the self-assessment process, rather than taking it on themselves, no doubt also helped to make the process facilitation more neutral. The diversity of the stakeholders brought to the table at the self-assessment workshop was exemplary, and women and indigenous peoples were well-represented.

---

self-assessment workshops held in other countries had been actively involved in the REDD+ readiness process.



11. Finally, judging from the critical conclusions and extensive recommendations that resulted from the self-assessment process (as summarized in Chapter 4 of the R-Package report), it appears that the self-assessment workshop was well-facilitated.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: Guatemala's R-Package report provides ample information on the facilitation of the self-assessment workshops, and it is clear that the process was highly transparent and participatory, allowing a diversity of stakeholders to have their say. The Ministry of the Environment's decision to assign the responsibility for facilitating the self-assessment process to an independent consultancy firm rather than taking it on themselves no doubt also helped to make the process more neutral. The diversity of stakeholders represented at the self-assessment workshop was exemplary, and women and indigenous peoples were well represented. Finally, the good quality of the stakeholder suggestions for improvements for the remainder of the REDD Readiness process made during the self-assessment workshop, as reported in the R-package report, provides further evidence of the high quality of process facilitation.*

12. **Time frame and development of the Readiness Process.**<sup>13</sup> Guatemala has been formally involved with FCPF in REDD+ related activities since 2008, when the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources submitted its R-PIN to the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility. Since then, the country has been working with a number of partners on REDD+, both public agencies such as the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), USAID and the World Bank-managed Forest Carbon Partnership Facility, as well as civil society organizations such as CARE and IUCN, not just on national REDD+ Readiness but also on implementation of four sub-national voluntary REDD+ projects. Guatemala submitted subsequent revisions of its Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) to the FCPF Participants' Committee in 2011, 2012 and in 2013, when the R-PP was finally approved. In April 2014, Guatemala signed a US\$3.8 million Readiness Grant with the Inter-American Development Bank, to fund stakeholder consultations, REDD+ strategy preparation, and elaboration of REL and MRV system. The mid-term progress report and request for additional funding was submitted to FCPF in March 2016.<sup>14</sup> The relatively long interlude between the approval of the FCPF Additional Financing grant in May 2016, and the planned start of its execution in the first quarter of 2018, over 1.5 years later, is not explained. Other financial and technical partners that have contributed over US\$1.3 million of funds as well as technical expertise to Guatemala's REDD+ Readiness progress include CARE, FAO, IUCN, UNDP, USAID and the sponsors of the aforementioned four ongoing sub-national REDD+ projects.<sup>15</sup>

13. In October 2014, an initial Emission Reduction Project Idea Note (ER-PIN) for a national-level emissions reduction program (ERP) was presented to

---

<sup>13</sup> The following information has been summarized from the R-Package report (which does not cover this topic systematically) and from the FCPF and IDB websites and the documents posted there, as well as other sources.

<sup>14</sup> See

[https://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/sites/fcp/files/2016/Mar/MTR\\_Guatemala\\_2016.pdf](https://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/sites/fcp/files/2016/Mar/MTR_Guatemala_2016.pdf)

<sup>15</sup> Their contributions are summarized in Table 2 of the R-Package report.

the FCPF, after the presentation of an early idea in June 2014.<sup>16</sup> The government of Guatemala signed the letter of intent for the ERP with the World Bank FCPF in April 2017. An additional grant of US\$5 million for further REDD+ Readiness work is planned for signature with the IDB in 2018. This additional grant will fund: (i) the implementation of Territorial Dialogue Plans for stakeholder consultation on the REDD+ strategy; (ii) Engagement on REDD+ with strategic non-forest sector institutions such as the Ministry of Finance and the Secretariat of Planning of the Presidency; (iii) Structuring and operationalization of the Benefit Sharing Mechanism; (iv) Alignment of the REDD+ Strategy with the PROBOSQUE law; (v) Structuring and operationalization of the REDD+ Registry; (vi) Strengthening of the MRV system in key REDD+ territories; and (vii) Incorporation of gender and cultural issues in the REDD+ strategy.<sup>17</sup> In June 2017, the Forest Investment Program (FIP) approved Guatemala's Investment Plan, which foresees three projects for financing the country's ENDDBG, for a total FIP contribution of US\$24 million.<sup>18</sup> Guatemala has not yet submitted its reference emissions level/reference level (REL/RL) to UNFCCC. Its current reference period, 2001-2010, will need to be updated to render it acceptable, but a lot of the methodological work has already been completed. In the meantime, some of the four REDD+ sub-national projects mentioned above are already producing Verified Emissions Reductions. In summary, Guatemala is already in transition from the readiness to the investment (through the approval of its Forest Investment Plan) phase of REDD+, and, following the completion of its R-Package, aims to move to the third REDD+ phase of results-based payments for verified emission reductions from deforestation and forest degradation.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: the timeline and milestones of Guatemala's REDD+ preparation and readiness activities since 2008 are not systematically covered in the R-package report, therefore the TAP review has briefly summarized them from the R-Package report and the FCPF website and other sources. Quite a few of the elements needed for performance-based REDD+ emissions reductions payments are now in place, but the REL/RL still needs to be updated before it can be submitted to and verified by UNFCCC. Going forward, the R-package report does provide a thorough assessment of the current level of Readiness of each of the sub-components and a summary of the remaining activities that will need to be implemented in 2018-2020 (using the US\$5 million additional Readiness grant approved by FCPF) in order to consolidate the REDD+ Readiness Phase, which is the main purpose of the R-Package report.*

14. The quality of Guatemala's R-Package report largely met the expectations of the TAP reviewer, with the exception of a few details, such as the occasional defunct hyperlink to a study report cited. The multi-

---

<sup>16</sup> Guatemala's October 2014 ER-PIN can be accessed on <https://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/sites/fcp/files/2014/september/Guatemala%20ER-PIN%20Version%20Sept%202014.pdf>.

<sup>17</sup> Table 1 of the R-Package report provides a budget for the completion of this work over the 2018-2020 period.

<sup>18</sup> The names, FIP contributions and estimated co-financing amounts of the three projects are provided in Table 3 of the R-Package report.

stakeholder self-assessment process is described in some detail, and was conducted in a highly participatory and transparent manner, with a consultancy firm acting as the independent facilitator. Furthermore, the R-Package report provides a good summary of the substantive results of the self-assessment process conducted, and of the work that remains to be done to consolidate the REDD Readiness phase.<sup>19</sup> The Readiness scores from this self-assessment are generally lower than those of the 2016 Mid-Term Review. This is probably more due to the unfamiliarity with REDD+ of many of the (self-selected) participants at the self-assessment workshop than to any real “back-sliding” since the MTR. In reality, the REDD+ Readiness process has made considerable progress in recent years, and once the additional US\$5 million FCPF grant will be effective, the country will be in a good position to complete its key Readiness elements by 2020.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: the Guatemala R-package report provides an acceptable overview of the advancement of REDD+ Readiness in the country, though as noted above, the Readiness scores attributed by the multi-stakeholder self-assessment workshop were probably somewhat lower than could be justified by actual progress achieved. The description of the conduct of the multi-stakeholder self-assessment process was sufficiently detailed to provide reassurance that the process was participatory and transparent. The conclusions and recommendations of the stakeholder process on how to address remaining gaps in REDD+ Readiness are well-summarized in the R-Package report, and will provide valuable inputs for the remainder of the REDD+ Readiness phase.*

---

<sup>19</sup> The work that remains to be done to achieve REDD+ Readiness is discussed in some detail under the sub-heading “Steps to Follow in the Process” for each of the sub-components, and a consolidated summary of the most important recommendations is given on pp. 104-105.

## **TAP Review Part B: summary of the REDD+ Processes – Strengths and Weaknesses of the R-Package as highlighted by Guatemala’s self-assessment**

*This part of the TAP review focuses on the self-assessment results; progress indicators (color scores) for the nine sub-components, significant achievements and areas requiring further development.*

15. The R-Package report and the documents referenced therein provide sufficient documentation to assess Guatemala’s progress with REDD+ Readiness, as well as the challenges remaining.
16. The Introduction explains the national and international policy context of Guatemala’s REDD+ Readiness work as well as the structure of the R-Package report. It also highlights some of the main recent REDD+ Readiness achievements in Guatemala, including the completion of the ENDDBG – which includes the national REDD+ strategy – and its alignment with the national policy framework and the elaboration of new forest incentive programs, governed by the PINPEP and PROBOSQUE Laws.
17. Chapter 2 describes the substantive progress achieved so far for each of the REDD+ Readiness sub-components, whereas the REDD+ Readiness scores for each of the 34 criteria are provided in Chapter 4, along with the remaining tasks and necessary improvements identified by the self-assessment workshop for each of the 9 sub-components. Unfortunately, most of the key reports documenting REDD+ progress mentioned in the text are not hyperlinked under the respective chapters – however, they are readily available under the hyperlink cited at the beginning of the Annex.<sup>20</sup> In the following, progress with each of the different REDD+ Readiness components and sub-components is reviewed on the basis of the Guatemala’s self-assessment report.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: the R-Package report, in combination with the documents referenced in it, gives a comprehensive overview of REDD+ Readiness progress in Guatemala.*

18. The overall REDD+ Readiness progress assessment, which is provided in Chapter 3 of the R-package report and reproduced below, contrasts the color scores for each of the REDD+ Readiness sub-components at the MTR in 2016 (third column), with the average color scores from the R-package report (fourth column). Only one sub-component, “4b Information System for multiple benefits, other impacts, governance and safeguards”, scores better than at MTR, whereas four sub-components score equal and four score worse. Overall, the R-Package report shows two green, three yellow and four orange scores for the nine sub-components, compared to five

---

<sup>20</sup> All the REDD+ documents cited in the R-package report are available on [http://www.marn.gob.gt/s/redd\\_/paginas/Paquete\\_de\\_preparacin](http://www.marn.gob.gt/s/redd_/paginas/Paquete_de_preparacin)

green, two yellow and two orange scores at the time of the MTR.<sup>21</sup>

**Table 1. Progress summary at sub-component level at MTR and R-Package<sup>22</sup>**

COMPONENTS	SUB-COMPONENTS	STATUS AT MTR 2016	STATUS AT R-PACKAGE
<b>1.Readiness Organization and Consultation</b>			
	1a. National REDD+ Management Arrangements	Green	Yellow
	1b. Consultation, Participation and Outreach	Green	Orange
<b>2.REDD+ Strategy Preparation</b>			
	2a. Assessment of Land Use, Land Use Change drivers, forest law, policy and governance	Yellow	Orange
	2b. REDD+ Strategy options <sup>23</sup>	Green	Green
	2c. Implementation framework	Green	Orange
	2d. Social and Environmental Impacts	Yellow	Yellow
<b>3.Reference emissions level/Reference Level (REL/RL)</b>		Green	Green
<b>4.Monitoring system for forests and safeguards</b>			
	4a. National Forest Monitoring System	Orange	Orange
	4b. Information System for Multiple Benefits, Other Impacts, Governance and Safeguards	Orange	Yellow

19. From the material presented in the R-Package report, it is not possible to assess whether the perceptions of the different stakeholder groups represented at the self-assessment workshop diverged significantly or not, as just one consensus score for each of the 34 criteria and the 9 sub-components was provided in the R-Package report.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>21</sup> As noted above, part of the reason for these lower scores may well lie in the unfamiliarity of many self-assessment workshop participants with REDD+, whereas the MTR scores were provided by stakeholders having long worked on REDD+ Readiness in Guatemala.

<sup>22</sup> This table is included on p. 75 of the R-Package report.

<sup>23</sup> Though this sub-component is scored green in the overview table, the three constituent criteria (16-18) were attributed two yellow scores and one orange one, so that should average out as yellow.

<sup>24</sup> In some of the other R-Package reports, significant differences in the Readiness scores of the different stakeholder groups were signaled – and some criteria or sub-components were not scored by some groups, as the latter felt they did not have the required knowledge to score them.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: the documentation provided does not allow the TAP review to assess any potential differences in the perceptions on REDD+ Readiness of different stakeholder groups, as the readiness scores were attributed by consensus in the self-assessment workshop.*

## **Component 1: Readiness, Organization and Consultation**

### ***Sub-Component 1a: National REDD+ Management Arrangements (Criteria 1-6, Readiness score: yellow)***

**20. Operationalization of REDD+ management arrangements.** Guatemala has created a significant array of coordinating bodies and stakeholder platforms to oversee the REDD+ Readiness process, which are described in detail in Chapter 2. REDD+ activities are organized at three levels: political, technical and social. The National Council on Climate Change (CNCC), which is chaired by the Presidency of the Republic, provides political oversight. It is composed of representatives of the public and private sector, indigenous and farmer organizations, municipalities, local governments, indigenous authorities, NGOs and academia. The Inter-agency Coordination Group, GCI, was established as the multi-sector coordination agency for the coordination and oversight of REDD+ activities. It includes a political level, comprised of the Ministers, Manager and Secretary, and a technical level, made up by the Directorates, Departments, Climate Change Units of Government Ministries and by representatives from the above-mentioned civil society groups in the CNCC. Forestry sector activities in Guatemala fall under two main agencies, the National Forestry Institute (INAB), and the National Council of Protected Areas (CONAP), which oversees the management of 328 Protected Areas. The two agencies each have a national office and 9 (INAB) and 10 (CONAP) regional offices that execute activities in the field. INAB and CONAP interact with a variety of stakeholder platforms, including the PINPEP beneficiary network, the National Alliance of Forest Community Organizations, the co-management roundtables constituted for the Protected Areas, the seven regional Forestry Roundtables and the Network of Indigenous Peoples and Authorities.

21. The preparation of the ENDDBG (which includes the REDD+ strategy) has benefited from the inputs of a number of forest governance platforms, the most active ones of which have been the Platform on Forests, Biodiversity and Climate Change (GBByCC), the Group of REDD+ Project Implementers (GIREDD+), the National Committee on Environmental and Social Safeguards, the National NGO Climate Change Roundtable and the Indigenous Climate Change Roundtable.

**22. Accountability and transparency.** The execution of the budget for the preparation of the National REDD+ Strategy, which is governed by the State Contracting Act and by the fiduciary policies of the IDB, is managed

---

This provided additional information to the authorities responsible for REDD+ on necessary consultation and information activities going forward.



by the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MARN). MARN uses the System of Integrated Accounting (SICOIN), a public platform that facilitates both internal monitoring of the project, as well as transparently providing financial information, registries and archives for outside scrutiny. The administrative and financial management of the funds is regularly audited by the Comptroller General's Office and by an auditing firm mandated by IDB. Guatemala's REDD+ related information (e.g., study reports, REDD+ consultation meeting minutes and participants lists, public notices) is made available through the MARN website.

- 23. Feedback and grievance redress mechanism (criterion 6).** The Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) for REDD+ in Guatemala is called "Mechanism of Information and Attention to Complaints", known under its Spanish acronym MIAQ. MIAQ, which was designed as part of the SESA/ESMF participatory process, will not replace existing legal or customary systems for dealing with feedback and grievances, but complement them. The most likely categories of complaints to be handled by MIAQ include participation and consultations; tenure of land and use of forest resources; rights of indigenous peoples and communities; and distribution of benefits. MIAQ will be coordinated by the Ministry of the Environment (MARN), and operate under the central and regional offices of MARN, the Ministry of Agriculture (MAGA), INAB and CONAP. It will deal with grievances in five steps: (i) receipt and registration; (ii) research; (iii) selection of an approach; (iv) evaluation and response; (v) monitoring. The intention is to deliver a contractually binding resolution within around 30 working days. Stakeholders will have various ways of lodging complaints, electronically through the REDD+ information system (SIREDD+) and verbally or in writing to the central or regional offices of GCI members.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: Guatemala has made significant progress in establishing the REDD+ management arrangements at national and local level. This translated in a yellow score for sub-component 1a overall, but out of 6 criteria two had an orange and one a red score, so they will still require significant work. The mechanisms for multi-sector coordination and cross-sectoral collaboration, while operational, need to be strengthened to involve actors from outside the forestry sector more actively in addressing the causes of deforestation and forest degradation. The self-assessment workshop also recommended that MIAQ, the feedback and grievance redress mechanism, be made fully operational as soon as possible. These issues will be revisited under part C of the TAP review report.*

#### **Sub-Component 1b: Consultation, Participation and Outreach (criteria 7-10, Readiness score: orange)**

- 24. Inclusion of stakeholders through an extended consultation, information and participation process (criteria 7, 8 and 10).** The objectives of Guatemala's work on REDD+ consultation, participation and outreach are twofold: (a) ensure that the ENDDBG (which includes the REDD+ strategy) takes into account and includes the positions of the

indigenous peoples and the consensual interests of the interested parties, in compliance with international standards and guidelines; and (b) promote voluntary and free participation of stakeholders (including forest dependent communities, indigenous peoples and women's organizations) in such a way that participatory processes can generate REDD+ governance support from territories and regions. To this end, a Dialogue and Participation Plan was prepared that closely follows the UN-REDD and FCPF guidelines on the topic, in particular the following eight steps: (i) define the desired outcomes of consultations; (ii) identify stakeholders; (iii) define the issues to consult on; (iv) define the terms of the consultation; (v) select the consultation and outreach methods; (vi) ensure that stakeholders have sufficient capacity to engage in consultations; (vii) conduct the consultations; and (viii) analyze and disseminate results.<sup>25</sup> The Dialogue and Participation Plan was designed based on a review of precious dialogue processes, field visits and more than 200 stakeholder interviews.<sup>26</sup> This Plan, which was presented at, and validated by, a September 2017 National Forum bringing together 88 people (33 women and 55 men) from a variety of stakeholder groups<sup>27</sup>, is being implemented since November 2017 through five so-called Territorial Plans of Dialogue and Participation, situated in priority regions for avoided deforestation and degradation, and for increase of forest carbon stocks.<sup>28</sup> These Territorial Plans were designed by the locally relevant stakeholders themselves, and thus take into account the particular context of each of the five regions. The Plans were then agreed between the stakeholders and the regional directorates of the GCI. To date, 291 interested parties (38% women and 62% men) have participated in these regional consultations.<sup>29</sup> Stakeholder databases and templates have been created to facilitate stakeholder dialogue and record inputs received.

25. To reinforce the information exchange with REDD+ stakeholders, MARN created a dedicated Email address ([red-guatemala@gmail.com](mailto:red-guatemala@gmail.com)) and enabled virtual exchange via the SIREDD+ Platform. All the REDD+ technical studies and stakeholder interaction documents produced are posted on the MARN website. While the consultation, information and participation activities summarized above represent a significant investment and effort, the R-Package report concluded that they will need to be greatly intensified during the final phase of REDD+ Readiness. Until the deployment of the Territorial Plans of Dialogue in November 2017,

---

<sup>25</sup> For a visual representation of this iterative process, see Figure 5 in the R-package report.

<sup>26</sup> The Dialogue and Participation Plan (in Spanish) can be accessed at <http://www.marn.gob.gt/Multimedios/9625.pdf>

<sup>27</sup> Participants included representatives from the public sector, national networks, indigenous peoples, women's groups, municipalities, NGOs and the private sector. The invitations, presentations and final report of the National Forum (in Spanish) can be accessed at [http://www.marn.gob.gt/s/redd\\_/paginas/Foro\\_Nacional\\_de\\_Dialogo\\_y\\_Participacin](http://www.marn.gob.gt/s/redd_/paginas/Foro_Nacional_de_Dialogo_y_Participacin)

<sup>28</sup> The five initial territories identified to implement these Territorial Plans are: Northern Lowlands (Petén), Caribbean (Izabal), Western (Quetzaltenango), Verapaces (Alta Verapaz), and East (Chiquimula).

<sup>29</sup> Table 6 of the R-package report summarizes the consultation, information and participation activities undertaken against the 8 steps



most stakeholder interaction has happened in governance platforms at the national level and through Information and Communication Technology that most local stakeholders don't have access to. In the next phase, more extensive use will need to be made of local communication mechanisms and channels, in formats that are understandable locally – including in Mayan languages.

**26. Quality of stakeholder participation.** While the quality of stakeholder participation in the Guatemala REDD\_ process has generally been good, it has been a challenge with some stakeholder groups to obtain wider participation by women and youth. Many consultations have taken place at national level, and some of the local stakeholders who participated in the self-assessment workshop had received very little prior information on REDD+.

**27. Information sharing and accessibility of information (criteria 9).** In addition to the extensive face-to-face consultations and the publication of documents in print and on-line, Guatemala has also reached out to the public with audio-visual productions. But as noted above, even though there are many publication and dissemination activities, the stakeholders in some regions have difficulty accessing REDD+ related information.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: The average score for sub-component 1b was orange, even though Guatemala has invested considerable energy and resources to enable a variety of key stakeholders to have a say in the development of REDD+ Readiness, not just through the recent Territorial Dialogues but also in the earlier elaboration of SESA/ESMF, the MIAQ, the Gender and REDD+ Roadmap and other REDD+ Readiness elements. However, most of the consultation, information and participation activities so far have taken place in national governance platforms and through electronic means – which are not accessible to the majority of REDD+ stakeholders. The R-Package report concludes that efforts should be stepped up to engage local communities, and especially women, youth and indigenous peoples, more fully in the REDD+ process. The R-Package report lays out a number of strategies for doing this, and notes that some of these have started to be applied in the Territorial Dialogue Plans that have been operating since November 2017.*

## **Component 2: REDD+ Strategy Preparation**

### ***Sub-Component 2a: Assessment of land use, land use change drivers, forest law, policy and governance (criteria 11-15, Readiness score: orange)***

**28. Assessment of land use trends and analysis of drivers of deforestation and forest degradation.** The assessment of the causes of land use change and the drivers of deforestation – estimated at 107,000 ha annually – and forest degradation was updated recently in a January 2018 publication by GCI.<sup>30</sup> The R-Package report provides a good summary of the different land uses responsible for deforestation in Guatemala, three of which

---

<sup>30</sup> The preliminary report on the assessment of deforestation drivers (in English) is available on <http://www.marn.gob.gt/Multimedios/9647.pdf>

account for 84% of the total: pasture (35%), basic grains (31%) and coffee (18%).<sup>31</sup> Other land uses cited as responsible for deforestation are oil palm (4%), cardamom (3%) and rubber (3%).<sup>32</sup> The main agents of forest degradation are unsustainable and uncontrolled firewood extraction; illegal and unsustainable extraction of timber and other products; and forest fires. According to the above-cited report on deforestation drivers, the main underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation are to be found in the model of economic growth, population growth, poverty, the education system and land tenure, among others. The information on deforestation and degradation drivers used for the REDD+ strategy was generated through forest cover mapping exercises (done for 1991, 1996, 2001, 2006, 2010 and 2011) and country studies (including on analysis of livelihoods and drivers and agents of deforestation), secondary information and participatory exercises in the territories.

29. A more detailed analysis of the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation and their links to the policy frameworks of the forestry, agriculture and energy sectors is currently ongoing.

30. The self-assessment workshop rated the assessment and analysis of drivers (criterion 11) and the prioritization of direct and indirect drivers and barriers to forest carbon stock enhancement (criteria 12) as orange, whereas the links between drivers/barriers and proposed REDD+ activities were rated green, which can be read as an endorsement of the main thrust of the ENDDBG. During the self-assessment workshop, stakeholders insisted on the importance of the current lack of security of land and forest tenure (and relatedly on the rights to emissions reduction) as a key factor in driving deforestation and forest degradation – and on the fact that more detailed studies would be necessary to develop practical proposals to address this driver in different contexts. They also argued that important lessons for addressing the drivers of deforestation and degradation had been learned from the forestry and agroforestry incentive schemes (including PINPEP and PROBOSQUE) that Guatemala has implemented over the past decades and from the forest management tools such as concessions, community forests and protected areas.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: The R-package report provides a good summary of the preliminary findings of the studies on direct drivers and underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation in Guatemala, though it has to be noted that these studies are still work in progress, and are based on a slightly outdated reference level (2001-2010) that will need to be updated to comply with the Methodological Framework of the FCPF Carbon Fund. The R-Package report demonstrates there is a clear demand for more local information-sharing on this topic, and that more detailed work on insecurity of land and forest tenure*

---

<sup>31</sup> See figure 6 in the R-Package report.

<sup>32</sup> Guatemala is the world's leading producer of cardamom, the annual exports of which are worth some US\$200 million, providing income to 300,000 smallholder producers. Furthermore, Guatemala is the largest producer of rubber in Latin America, with annual exports worth US\$239 million.

*will be needed to enable Guatemala's REDD+ Strategy to address this driver effectively in different regional contexts.*

31. **Natural resources rights, land tenure, governance and implications for forest laws and policies.** These issues, which were addressed in a 2016 study, are amply covered in the R-Package report. The study<sup>33</sup> assessed 55 legal and policy instruments with an incidence on REDD+, 22 of which referred explicitly to and were aligned with the national REDD+ strategy (ENDDBG), while four showed incompatibilities with ENDDBG, namely: (i) the Agricultural Policy 2011-2015; the Irrigation Promotion Policy 2013-2023; the Agrarian Policy and the Framework Law to Regulate the Reduction of Vulnerability, Compulsory Adaptation to the Effects of Climate Change and Mitigation of Greenhouse Gases (Decree 7-2013 of the Congress of the Republic of Guatemala).<sup>34</sup> It is not clear from the R-Package report whether any progress has been made in reducing or eliminating these incompatibilities in the meantime. Going forward, the harmonization of public policy frameworks will be extremely important to make REDD+ implementation successful – and the limited success in reaching out to other sectors highlighted by the R-package report under sub-components 1a and 1b is a matter of concern in this respect.

32. Another key legal/policy issue for REDD+ in Guatemala is that of land and forest tenure. This was analyzed in a 2014 study supported by USAID<sup>35</sup>, which signaled the challenges to REDD+ implementation caused by the fact that the majority of rural dwellers are not formally recognized owners (with registered title), but rather “possessors” (with documented title, but not registered) or occupants of land that belong to third parties (including leasing, unregulated peaceful occupation and illegal occupation). The rights to participate in incentive schemes such as REDD+ are very different for these different categories of rural dwellers. Thankfully, Guatemala already has some experience with addressing these land tenure insecurity issues in the successive generations of its reforestation and forest management incentive schemes, including in the recent PINPEP, which provides incentives to “possessors” as well as owners, unlike its predecessor PINFOR which was restricted to owners. The new PROBOSQUE law will extend the horizon for the PINFOR program by 30 years, and open it to other types of beneficiaries, including “possessors”.

---

<sup>33</sup> This report (in Spanish) entitled “Systematization of the Forest Policy and Governance Framework for the construction of the National REDD+ Strategy in Guatemala”, is accessible on <http://www.marn.gob.gt/Multimedios/9643.pdf>

<sup>34</sup> The incompatibilities of these four policy/legal instruments are summarized in Table 8 of the R-Package report.

<sup>35</sup> Kuper, J. (2014). Guatemala Resources Tenure and Sustainable Landscapes Assessment. Washington, DC: USAID Tenure and Global Climate Change Program, accessible through

[https://www.land-links.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/USAID\\_Land\\_Tenure\\_TGCC\\_Guatemala\\_Assessment\\_En.pdf](https://www.land-links.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/USAID_Land_Tenure_TGCC_Guatemala_Assessment_En.pdf)

NB the Spanish version of this document is available on the MARN website, under “Paquete de preparacion”.

33. **Carbon rights.** The issue of carbon rights was also highlighted as a matter of concern by the participants in the self-assessment workshop, but is not mentioned in the R-Package report. Some REDD+ projects are already under implementation in Guatemala, but the R-Package report does not provide any information on whether and how they addressed the carbon rights issue. It is not clear from the R-package report whether or not the issue of carbon rights requires further work in the context of REDD+ Readiness – though the issue of the underlying land and forest tenure rights is of major concern for REDD+ implementation, as highlighted above.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: The average score for sub-component 2a is orange, with four criteria scored orange and only the criterion on links between drivers/barriers and REDD+ activities (13) scored green, so quite a lot of work still lies ahead. The study completed in 2016 on the existing land use policy and legal framework in relation to the evolving REDD+ strategy concluded that four policy/legal instruments were incompatible with the REDD+ strategy. It is not clear from the R-Package report whether any progress has been made in reducing or eliminating these incompatibilities in the meantime. Going forward, the harmonization of public policy frameworks will be extremely important to make REDD+ implementation successful – and the limited success in reaching out to other sectors highlighted by the R-package report under sub-components 1a and 1b is a matter of concern in this respect. The issue of land and forest tenure and related resource use rights and the challenges it poses to the implementation of the REDD+ strategy are well-summarized in the R-package report. Guatemala's recent move to open up long-established reforestation and forest management incentive schemes to people without registered land title (land "possessors") will provide useful experience for REDD+ implementation. The R-Package report highlights stakeholder concerns with the issue of carbon rights, but does not clarify whether any new laws or modifications of existing laws are required to address carbon rights.*

**Sub-Component 2b: REDD+ Strategy options (criteria 16-18, Readiness score: green)<sup>36</sup>**

34. **REDD+ Strategy.** The preliminary version for consultation of the "National Strategy for the Approach of Deforestation and Degradation of Forests in Guatemala", (henceforth referred to as the National REDD+ Strategy), was published in January 2018.<sup>37</sup> It has three major axes: (i) avoided deforestation; (ii) avoided degradation and (iii) restoration of degraded lands and forests.<sup>38</sup> The three axes are further subdivided in 14 strategic thrusts, and 27 strategic actions.<sup>39</sup> A subset of priority short-term REDD+ activities that has been prioritized under Guatemala's ER-PIN includes: (i) incentives for conservation and sustainable management of natural forests; (ii) strengthening governance in forest lands; (iii)

<sup>36</sup> Judging from the three constituent criteria, which were given two yellow and one orange score, the actual sub-component score should probably be yellow.

<sup>37</sup> The ENDDBG can be accessed on <http://www.marn.gob.gt/Multimedios/9864.pdf>

<sup>38</sup> Description of the three axes is taken from the January 2018 version of the Strategy, which is different from that given in the R-Package report.

<sup>39</sup> The January 2018 version of the National REDD+ Strategy can be accessed on <http://www.marn.gob.gt/Multimedios/9864.pdf>

incentives to increase carbon stocks; (iv) improved forest management; (v) promotion of competitiveness and legality in forest product value chains; and (vi) incentives for smallholders, local communities and indigenous peoples.<sup>40</sup>

35. Guatemala's preliminary National REDD+ Strategy is based on the lessons learned from twenty years of government-led forestry programmes (including protected areas, reforestation and forest management incentive schemes), and on stakeholder inputs on received during the second round of the Regional Meetings for Dialogue and Participation, held from October to December 2017. It also benefited from the inputs of ongoing REDD+ pilot projects<sup>41</sup> and consultant experts. The REDD+ Strategy options are not discussed in detail in the R-Package report, but they are well-explained in the above-mentioned preliminary version of the National REDD+ Strategy.

36. The self-assessment workshop scored this sub-component yellow, with criteria 16 and 17 – selection and prioritization of REDD+ strategy options, and feasibility assessment, respectively – attracting yellow scores, whereas criterion 18, implications of strategy options on existing sectoral policies was scored orange. The workshop participants particularly requested a timeline for resolving the four non-forest sector policy/legal instruments that were deemed to be incompatible with the national REDD+ Strategy. They also commented that an update of the reference level to 2016 might have implications for the REDD+ strategy options, so it would be important to complete this update as soon as possible.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: the R-package report outlines the main contours of Guatemala's REDD+ Strategy, but does not discuss the individual REDD+ strategy options nor the risks inherent in the strategy. These options and the associated social and environmental risks, however, are well-explained in the January 2018 preliminary version of the National REDD+ Strategy. Although the overall score assigned to this sub-component was yellow, the criterion on the implications of strategy options on existing sectoral policies was scored orange, confirming that considerable work remains to be done on the REDD+ strategy options – especially on addressing incompatibilities between non-forestry sector policy/legal instruments and the REDD+ strategy. This will require getting other sectors to buy into the REDD+ Strategy and its implementation, as highlighted under sub-components 1a and 2a above.*

### **Sub-Component 2c: Implementation Framework (criteria 19-22, Readiness**

---

<sup>40</sup> See Table 9 of the R-Package report.

<sup>41</sup> The REDD+ pilot projects that provided inputs for the National REDD+ Strategy are Guatecarbon (see <http://guatecarbon.com/el-proyecto/>), Lacandon Forests for Life (see <http://bosques-lacandon.org/>), Coast of Conservation (<http://theconservationcoast.com/>), and Agroforestry and Forest Restoration for Ecological Connectivity, Poverty Reduction and the Conservation of Biodiversity in Cerro San Gil (<http://www.fundacioncalmecac.org/> )

score: orange)

**37. Adoption, and guidelines for implementation, of legislation/regulations (criteria 19 and 20).** Although there is no specific REDD+ legal instrument in Guatemala, there are a number of existing policy/legal instruments that have an incidence on REDD+, most of which are well-aligned with the National REDD+ Strategy. These include the legal frameworks for the main forest sector agencies, CONAP and INAB, and the policy instruments for the various forestry incentive schemes. Only four legal/policy instruments, all of them from outside the forestry sector, demonstrate incompatibilities with the REDD+ strategy, as explained above. During the self-assessment workshop, stakeholder representatives highlighted a number of implementation framework issues, including the gaps in the definition of carbon rights and the transfer of emission ownership, the need to link REDD-related legislation to the Law of Development and Decentralization Councils, as well as with energy sector laws.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: Overall, sub-component 2c was given an “orange” score, indicating that a very considerable amount of work is still needed. While many elements of Guatemala’s legal and regulatory framework for enabling REDD+ implementation are already in place, they will need improved alignment with non-forestry sector legal instruments, including those governing decentralization to become fully operational. Certain specific legal issues such as carbon rights also require clarification.*

**38. Benefit sharing mechanism (criterion 21, red).** While Guatemala has gained considerable experience with reforestation and forest management incentive schemes benefiting smallholders, and while the four ongoing sub-national REDD+ pilot projects all have an operational REDD+ Benefit Sharing Mechanism (BSM), so far no BSM has been put forward for stakeholder discussion. Therefore, the self-assessment workshop recommended that rules for a BSM would be proposed as soon as possible, based on the experience gained with incentive schemes such as PINFOR, PINPEP and PROBOSQUE, and on operational BSMs in ongoing REDD+ pilot projects. The ongoing Territorial Dialogues might constitute good platforms for discussing the BSM.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: further dialogue is needed to agree on the modalities of the national REDD+ Benefit Sharing Mechanism (BSM), and to put in place the means for its implementation. The Readiness score assigned to this criterion was red, showing that urgent action is needed to get this key element of REDD+ up and running.*

**39. National REDD+ registry and system monitoring REDD+ activities (criterion 22, red).** In general terms, the function of a national REDD+ registry is to provide geo-referenced information on location, ownership, carbon accounting and financial flows for sub-national and national REDD+ programs and projects. In Guatemala, the work on a national



REDD+ registry has not yet started. .

➔ *TAP Conclusion: The R-Package report does not provide any evidence of work done on a national REDD+ Registry, so presumably, this still needs to start. The red score for this criterion assigned by the self-assessment workshop therefore appears to be justified.*

***Sub-Component 2d: Social and Environmental Impacts (criteria 23-25, Readiness score: yellow)***

40. ***Social and Environmental Impacts.*** In 2016, Guatemala developed a National Approach to Safeguards (ENS)<sup>42</sup>, as required by UNFCCC, and mandated by the country's national Framework Law on Climate Change. The safeguard policies of the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) for the REDD+ Readiness process are: Environmental Assessment; Natural Habitats; Forests; Involuntary Resettlement (which also covers loss of livelihood without displacement of residence); Indigenous Peoples and Physical and Cultural Resources.<sup>43</sup>
41. The Forest Carbon Partnership Facility requires the use of Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) and the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF). The SESA serves to ensure that social and environmental issues are integrated in REDD+ preparation. The ESMF is defined as a guide to the screening of the proposed REDD+ Program interventions to ensure that they do not negatively affect the natural and social environment. It is an essential tool for programs where the precise locations where activities will be implemented are not yet known, as is the case with many of Guatemala's proposed REDD+ activities.
42. Guatemala completed the SESA<sup>44</sup> and the ESMF<sup>45</sup> in 2017, after extensive consultations with 611 stakeholders (242 women and 369 men) in 2015-2016, including at local level. In addition, a Gender and REDD+ Roadmap was elaborated with inputs from 291 stakeholders (240 women and 51 men). Despite good progress on all the deliverables under this sub-component, the readiness scores attributed by the self-assessment workshop were highly uneven, ranging from a red score for criterion 23 (analysis of social and environmental safeguard issues) to a green score for criterion 25 (environmental and social management framework). Apparently, the red score was attributed because the self-assessment workshop participants wanted to draw attention to the fact that they needed more detail on how the safeguards would be addressed in their

---

<sup>42</sup> The ENS is available (in Spanish) on <http://www.marn.gob.gt/Multimedios/9651.pdf>

<sup>43</sup> The specific triggers and details of the operational policies are listed in Table 13 of the R-Package report.

<sup>44</sup> The SESA (in Spanish) can be accessed on <http://www.marn.gob.gt/Multimedios/9653.pdf>

<sup>45</sup> The ESMF (in Spanish) can be accessed on <http://www.marn.gob.gt/Multimedios/9655.pdf>

territories – according to the socio-cultural context of each region – detail of which was not forthcoming. The stakeholders also argued that there was no clarity in the way safeguards would be operationalized – and demanded that lessons learned from experience with safeguards in the REDD+ pilot projects would be taken into account in the operationalization.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: Guatemala has made good progress with regards to the REDD+ Readiness deliverables related to Safeguards, with SESA, ESMF and gender/REDD+ Roadmap, for which hundreds of stakeholders were consulted – though this progress does not appear to have been fully recognized by the stakeholder representatives. Improvements identified by the self-assessment workshop included increased local information sharing and more stakeholder interaction to discuss operationalization of the safeguard instruments in specific locations.*

### **Component 3: Reference Levels/Emission Reference levels (criteria 26-28, Readiness score: green<sup>46</sup>)**

**43.** The Reference Emission Level (REL, expressed in tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent, tCO<sub>2</sub>e) is the benchmark for assessing a country's performance in the implementation of REDD+ activities.<sup>47</sup> A REL is required to access performance-based payments, as the performance of a REDD+ initiative would be measured by comparing actual GHG emissions and removals with a defined level of GHG emissions or removals (historical emission level or the projected business as usual, BAU, scenario).

**44.** Guatemala has a long history of collecting forest data (going back decades for the National Forest Inventory), enabling the construction of a REL based on national activity data and emission factors, rather than IPCC default values that must be used in the absence of such local data. The country published its preliminary national Reference Levels for Deforestation, Forest Degradation, and Increase of Carbon Stocks in January 2018<sup>48</sup>, but has not submitted its reference emission levels to UNFCCC yet. The national REL for deforestation, based on the period 2001-2010 is 44.98 MtCO<sub>2</sub>e/year, more than half of which derives from the Region “Tierras Bajas del Norte”. The national REL for Forest Degradation is 4.45 MtCO<sub>2</sub>e/year and the national REL for Increase of Carbon Stocks is -39,893 tCO<sub>2</sub>e/year. This gives an overall REL of 49.4 MtCO<sub>2</sub>e/year. Guatemala has also estimated reference emission levels for

---

<sup>46</sup> In the overview table, this component is rated “green” but the average score over the three constituent criteria, two yellows and one orange, is yellow.

<sup>47</sup> REL is the amount of gross emissions from a geographical area estimated within a reference time period. It is used to demonstrate emissions reductions from avoided deforestation and forest degradation.

<sup>48</sup> The updated January 2018 REL, which is still under review, is available on <http://www.marn.gob.gt/Multimedios/9661.pdf>



the three above-mentioned REDD+ activities in each of the five REDD+ sub-regions.<sup>49</sup>

- 45.** The calculated uncertainty for the REL is 3.27%, which is very low indeed. It will of course have to be confirmed by an independent technical assessment, once it has been submitted to UNFCCC. As noted above, and highlighted by the R-package report, the REL will need to be updated to a more recent time period, e.g. 2006-2016, in order to be acceptable to the FCPF Carbon Fund.
- 46.** The REL takes into account emissions from the above-ground biomass carbon pool (ABG) and also, for deforestation and degradation of forests on peatlands, soil organic carbon (SOC).
- 47.** CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated by multiplying Activity Data (AD) with the appropriate Emissions Factors (EF). ‘Activity data’ refers to the extent (in hectares) of a category of forest loss or afforestation. Practically speaking, therefore, activity data is often referred to as area data. ‘Emission factors’, also called carbon-stock-change factors by IPCC, refers to emissions/removals of greenhouse gases per unit area, e.g., tons carbon dioxide emitted per hectare of deforestation. Guatemala’s Activity Data used for the construction of the REL are land-cover data from the NFMS, which are publicly available on the NFMS website. The Emissions factors were estimated using the results of natural forest inventories done in four distinct forest types.
- 48. *Validity of the methodology chosen and compliance with IPCC/UNFCCC instructions.*** As the methodology chosen by Guatemala is aligned with IPCC Tier 3, the highest level of accuracy. Nevertheless, some improvements are still necessary, as highlighted in the R-Package report. For example, the Degradation REL currently covers only degradation by fires, not by non-sustainable extraction of firewood and illegal logging. And, as mentioned before, the REL period needs to be updated, to around 2006-2016. Furthermore, stakeholders at the self-assessment workshop argued that the information on reference levels should be shared more widely, including at community level, to facilitate implication of women’s and indigenous peoples’ groups in monitoring.
- 49. *Use of historical data, no adjustment for national circumstances.*** Guatemala uses the averages of historical deforestation and degradation data, without any adjustment for national circumstances.<sup>50</sup>

➔ *TAP Conclusion: Guatemala has made significant progress in establishing a REL at national level – with a recognized high-quality methodology. It has also developing five sub-national RELs, for each of its five REDD+ Regions. The various technical issues and methodological*

---

<sup>49</sup> The map showing the five REDD+ regions of Guatemala is provided in Figure 9 of the R-Package report.

<sup>50</sup> This is also the standard approach required by the FCPF Carbon Fund (CF) Methodological Framework, though it does allow adjusted reference levels under certain circumstances.

*choices involved in establishing the REL are well-summarized in the R-Package report, and explained in detail in the January 2018 REL report hyperlinked above. The “yellow” score assigned for this component confirms the considerable progress achieved. Moving forward towards an Emissions Reduction Program with the FCPF Carbon Fund, however, will require updating of the baseline period chosen for the REL, as highlighted in the R-Package report.*

## **Component 4: Monitoring systems for forests and safeguards**

### ***Sub-Component 4a: National forest monitoring system (criteria 29-31, Readiness score: orange)***

#### **50. Overall framework for Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV).**

Guatemala aims to build a single, national REDD+ information system (SIREDD+<sup>51</sup>), which will serve both for monitoring forests (NFMS, sub-component 4a) as well as multiple benefits, other impacts, governance and safeguards (sub-component 4b). SIREDD+ will thus be a repository for information on (i) accounting for emissions and removals of greenhouse gases from REDD+ activities; (ii) Compliance with the approach and respect of the safeguards in the implementation of REDD+ activities; and (iii) reporting on multiple benefits, other impacts and management. SIREDD+ in turn will feed Guatemala’s National Information System on Climate Change (SNICC), which was established under the Framework Law on Climate Change in 2013. The National REDD+ Registry, which will be designed with FCPF additional funding, will also be anchored to SIREDD+.

#### **51. Organizational structure, responsibilities and competencies.**

SIREDD+ will not generate new data itself, but will instead compile data received from other sector institutions, including CONAD, GIMBUT, INAB, MAGA and MARN.<sup>52</sup> Going forward, forest monitoring will be done annually, but prior to 2014, the periodicity depends on the availability of good quality LANDSAT imagery. The definition of proposed monitoring activities and their periodicity is provided in Table 23 of the R-Package report. Community monitoring, both of carbon emissions and non-carbon variables, will receive particular emphasis.<sup>53</sup> The design of the SIREDD+ web platform is currently being concluded. It will contain strategic information on each of the components of the ENDDBG.

#### **52. The REDD+ MRV system will be deployed at both National and Regional levels, with both using the same land cover data and assessment methodology. Regional-level capacity building activities are currently**

---

<sup>51</sup> The design document for SIREDD+, which was made available on the MARN website in 2017, can be accessed through <http://www.marn.gob.gt/Multimedios/9664.pdf>

<sup>52</sup> The proposed distribution of monitoring responsibilities according to thematic competence of each of the five institutions is provided in Table 22 of the R-Package report.

<sup>53</sup> The definition of community monitoring activities for the ENDDBG is provided in Table 24 of the R-Package report.

ongoing. With additional Readiness funds, regional-level monitoring systems can be further strengthened, for the monitoring of biodiversity, forest cover, fires and firewood, among others.

53. According to the R-Package report, information dissemination on SIREDD+ development has been poor and there has been little implication of local stakeholders in system development. The stakeholder representatives at the self-assessment workshop provided a number of recommendations for moving forward, including (i) accelerate the dissemination of SIREDD+ progress achieved to date, and allow local actors to present proposals on how to improve the system; (ii) make arrangements for including community monitoring outputs in SIREDD+; (iii) establish a strategy to start monitoring the indicators for which there is reporting capacity, and increase the scope progressively; and (iv) secure the stability of the governance framework and funding modalities for the MRV system as soon as possible. The issue of participatory monitoring will be discussed in more detail under sub-component 4b, Information system for multiple benefits, other impacts, governance and safeguards.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: the development of the national forest monitoring system (NFMS) has advanced with the design of the SIREDD+ system. SIREDD+ will be a “light” system, compiling data provided by others rather than generating new data itself. Building MRV capacity at the sub-national level will be a major challenge going forward. Overall, the sub-component has made significant progress, however it was scored orange as this progress had not been disseminated sufficiently to the stakeholders.*

***Sub-Component 4b: Information system for multiple benefits, other impacts, governance, and safeguards (criteria 32-34, Readiness score: yellow)***

54. ***Identification of relevant non-carbon aspects, and social and environmental issues (criterion 32) and Monitoring, reporting and information sharing (criterion 33).*** To monitor the generation of multiple benefits, a set of 34 indicators has been prioritized that the GCI members (CONAP, INAB, MAGA, MARN) already report on, as well as information gaps identified that will need to be filled in the medium term. As part of the development of SIREDD+, a format “Reporting Needs Linked to Non-Carbon Benefits and Safeguards” was developed – see R-Package report. Similarly, an outline of the REDD+ safeguards monitoring report was developed.
55. ***Institutional arrangements and capacities (criterion 34).*** The institutional architecture for the national forest monitoring system (SIREDD+), which will cover both emissions MRV and safeguards and other monitoring and reporting, is well-explained in the R-Package report. As noted above, SIREDD+ will be a “light” system. It will not generate new data itself, but will instead compile data received from other sector institutions, including CONAD, GIMBUT, INAB, MAGA and MARN.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: Even before REDD+ started, Guatemala's forest sector institutions were subject to many laws and rules obliging them to generate and disseminate data on social and environmental as well as economic impacts of their interventions. The development of the SIREDD+ information system, which covers both emissions MRV and monitoring of multiple benefits, other impacts, governance and safeguards has advanced considerably, and a web-based platform will be ready for testing in March 2018. Overall, the sub-component has made significant progress and was scored yellow.*

## **TAP Review Part C: Summary Assessment and Recommendation to the PC**

- 56. Guatemala conscientiously used the FCPF Readiness Assessment Framework, with slightly reworded criteria and guiding questions, to account for national circumstances and facilitate stakeholder comprehension. The self-assessment process presented some challenges, due to the fact that many (self-selected) workshop participants were unfamiliar with REDD+, and there was no time in the one-day workshop for stakeholders to be presented with detailed explanations of all the REDD+ Readiness Achievements so far.**
- 57. The preparation of the self-assessment workshop and the facilitation provided during the workshop are well-summarized in the R-Package report. The process appears to have been well facilitated, as there was a wide range of stakeholder groups represented, who provided useful and timely inputs to assess REDD+ readiness and determine what remains to be done to achieve it. The quality of inputs received from the workshop participants was excellent, as noted above, and as reported in the R-Package report.<sup>54</sup>**
- 58. Though the color scores attributed by the self-assessment workshop were generally lower than at MTR, as explained above, the R-Package report nevertheless documented significant progress achieved since the Mid-term Review (MTR) was held in 2016. Many key REDD+ Readiness elements are now falling into place: the consultation version of the national REDD+ Strategy has been published, the REL updated (though not yet submitted to UNFCCC), the National Forest Monitoring System (SIREDD+) designed, among others. At the same time, it is clear that a significant amount of work will be required to complete the Readiness phase.**
- 59. The self-assessment process provided a lot of useful feedback on specific elements of REDD+ Readiness that will require further work, which will be helpful as Guatemala moves towards completion of the REDD+ Readiness phase. Multi-stakeholder coordination needs to be improved as well as the ownership of REDD+ policies with key decision makers outside the forestry sector, especially agriculture, and at local**

---

<sup>54</sup> See especially the suggestions for improvement after each sub-component and the key recommendations at the end of Chapter 4.

government level. Consultations with local communities need to be intensified, and missing pieces such as the national Benefit Sharing Mechanism, and the incompatibilities between a number of policy/legal instruments and the REDD+ Strategy addressed as soon as possible, in order to enable the transition towards full-scale REDD+ implementation.

60. Based on the documents consulted, the **TAP reviewer is of the opinion that Guatemala's R-package report provides a reasonably accurate picture of REDD+ readiness progress in the country.**
61. **One key issue that will need to be resolved during the remainder of the Readiness phase is the outstanding legal and policy reforms, some of which are outside the control of the forestry sector. The acute land tenure insecurity faced by the majority of rural dwellers (whether indigenous peoples and smallholder farmers), for example, could become a major constraint for the implementation of the REDD+ strategy, if it is not addressed. Guatemala already has some practical experience with the provision of forestry incentives to rural dwellers that do not have fully registered title – which could provide some pathways for moving forward. Taking systematic action on this front, however, will require ample political will to address vested interests – and a sizable budget to enable mapping of the boundaries of indigenous and other local community territories as well as drafting of local government regulations or other instruments to guarantee the sustainability of the intervention.** Some of these outstanding reforms may pose significant risks to the delivery of the national-level emissions reductions program currently under discussion. This state of affairs renders the R-package report recommendation to step up cross-sectoral coordination efforts and increase buy-in to REDD+ of local-level governments and actors in other sectors, especially agriculture, even more urgent and important.