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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANAM</td>
<td>National Association of Municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOFC</td>
<td>National Alliance of Community Forest Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAAI</td>
<td>Guatemalan Association of Mayors and Indigenous Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASOREMA</td>
<td>National Association of natural resources, ecology and environmental non governmental organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCG</td>
<td>Climate, Nature, and Communities Programme of Guatemala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONAP</td>
<td>National Commission for Protected Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>Conference of Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>Country Safeguards Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER-PIN</td>
<td>Emission Reduction Program Idea Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCPF</td>
<td>Forest Carbon Partnership Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBByCC</td>
<td>Forests, Biodiversity and Climate Change Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIMBUT</td>
<td>Forest and other land uses Mapping Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIREDD</td>
<td>REDD+ Implementers Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IADB</td>
<td>Inter-American Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INAB</td>
<td>National Institute for Biodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>International Union for Conservation of Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAGA</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARN</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICC</td>
<td>Indigenous Climate Change Caucus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCI</td>
<td>Principles, Criteria and Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRCC</td>
<td>Regional Climate Change Programme of USAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDD+</td>
<td>Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDD+ SES</td>
<td>REDD+ Social &amp; Environmental Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SESA</td>
<td>Strategic Social and Environmental Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>Safeguards Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFCCC</td>
<td>United Nations Convention on Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN-REDD Programme</td>
<td>United National Programme to Reduce Emissions for Deforestation and Degradation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction

Since the UNFCCC Conference of Parties agreed five years ago in Cancun in December 2010 that seven safeguards should be applied to all REDD+ activities (see REDD+ safeguards: context and international policy section below), countries have been developing approaches to ensure these safeguards are addressed and respected. There has been significant progress and already some results from the development and implementation of country safeguards approaches (CSA) in many countries/jurisdictions. This report aims to take stock of progress and results of adopting a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards through an outcomes evaluation conducted by the REDD+ SES Initiative in Guatemala, where the Initiative has been working.

The main focus of the report is an examination of progress in developing and using CSA in Guatemala, and results flowing from this process, irrespective of whether there was a link between progress and support from the REDD+ SES Initiative. This approach recognized that the Initiative was one among various national and international actors and factors contributing to CSA development and use. Identifying outcomes of the process regardless of whether the Initiative contributed or not, or contributed directly or indirectly, allowed us to describe and gain an understanding of the wider system involving multiple national, international, government and civil society actors that has contributed to the development of CSAs. In addition to this system-wide picture, the report also looks at where, when and how the Initiative contributed to a CSA in Guatemala.

This evaluation report aims to help stakeholders recognize the value of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards for REDD+ and low emissions, sustainable land use more broadly by providing evidence-based, constructive feedback to;

i. government and civil society organizations in the participating countries/jurisdictions to help them to communicate about and to improve their country safeguards approach;

ii. agencies supporting the development of REDD+ safeguards to help them to improve their strategies and guidance materials; and,

iii. the funder of the REDD+ SES Initiative (Norad) to help them to understand the outcomes of their investment in this REDD+ safeguards initiative.
1.1 REDD+ safeguards: context and international policy

It is eight years since the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) 13th Conference of Parties (COP 13) in 2007 in Bali, Indonesia, initiated a program of work on reducing emissions from deforestation and degradation in developing countries, conservation of forests, sustainable management of forests and enhancing forest carbon stocks (REDD+). REDD+ strategies and activities seek to change the way that land is used against a ‘business as usual’ reference scenario. There has always been strong interest in the potential negative and positive social and environmental impacts of such land use interventions under REDD+ and associated governance issues. Particular attention has been focused on the impacts on forest-dependent peoples including Indigenous Peoples and local communities, women and groups that are vulnerable and/or marginalized.

To address some of these concerns, COP 16 in Cancun, Mexico, in 2010, defined seven safeguards to be applied when undertaking all REDD+ activities (referred to as the ‘Cancun safeguards’ - see Box 1), and requested countries to develop a system for providing information on how these safeguards are being addressed and respected throughout the implementation of REDD+ activities. The safeguards information systems (SIS) is one of the four key elements that a country must have in place for REDD+:

i. a National REDD+ Strategy or Action Plan;
ii. a National Forest Reference Emission Levels/National Forestry Reference Level;
iii. a National Forestry Monitoring System including Measurement, Reporting, and Verification Systems; and
iv. a Safeguards Information System.

In 2011, COP 17 in Durban, South Africa, provided guidance on the SIS, defining that it should be country-driven, transparent, build upon existing systems and provide information that is accessible by all relevant stakeholders (see Box 2). Countries were also requested to submit a summary of information on how all the safeguards have been addressed and respected. In 2013, COP 19 in Warsaw, Poland, reaffirmed that countries should have all four elements of REDD+ including the SIS in place, and should have submitted a summary of information on safeguards before obtaining and receiving results-based finance. The summary of information on safeguards should be included in national communications to the COP every four years after the start of implementation of REDD+ activities, and could be provided on a voluntary basis on the UNFCCC web platform. The Warsaw decisions concluded negotiations on REDD+ and all the relevant decisions on REDD+ are referred to as the ‘Warsaw framework for REDD+’. 
Box 1. Cancun safeguards – Decision 1/CP.16. Appendix 1 of UNFCCC

When undertaking the [REDD+] activities referred to in paragraph 70 of this decision, the following safeguards should be promoted and supported:

(a) That actions complement or are consistent with the objectives of national forest programmes and relevant international conventions and agreements;

(b) Transparent and effective national forest governance structures, taking into account national legislation and sovereignty;

(c) Respect for the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities, by taking into account relevant international obligations, national circumstances and laws, and noting that the United Nations General Assembly has adopted the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples;

(d) The full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, in particular, indigenous peoples and local communities in the actions referred to in paragraphs 70 and 72 of this decision;

(e) That actions are consistent with the
   - conservation of natural forests and biological diversity, ensuring that actions referred to in paragraph 70 of this decision are
   - not used for the conversion of natural forests, but are instead used to incentivize the protection and conservation of natural forests and their ecosystem services, and to enhance other social and environmental benefits:

(f) Actions to address the risks of reversals:

(g) Actions to reduce displacement of emissions.

Box 2. UNFCCC guidance on safeguards information systems - Decision 12/CP.17

2. Agrees that systems for providing information on how the safeguards ... are addressed and respected should, taking into account national circumstances and respective capabilities, and recognizing national sovereignty and legislation, and relevant international obligations and agreements, and respecting gender considerations:

(a) Be consistent with the guidance identified in decision 1/CP.16.;

(b) Provide transparent and consistent information that is accessible by all relevant stakeholders and updated on a regular basis;

(c) Be transparent and flexible to allow for improvements over time;

(d) Provide information on how all of the safeguards referred to in appendix I to decision 1/CP.16 are being addressed and respected;

(e) Be country-driven and implemented at the national level;

(f) Build upon existing systems, as appropriate;
1.2 Development of country safeguards approaches

Over the last five years since the Cancun safeguards were agreed in December 2010, countries have been developing their approach to safeguards. Several initiatives have developed guidance and provided technical advice to support these efforts, including the REDD+ SES Initiative, the UN-REDD Programme, World Resources Institute, the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF), Climate Law & Policy and the Netherlands Development Organization (SNV). These groups collaborated in 2012 to develop a conceptual framework for CSA that has been further developed and used in slightly different formats by each initiative. In general, the country safeguards approach involves, among other elements (see Figure 1):

- the country’s legal framework of policies, laws and regulations (PLR);
- an institutional framework defining the roles, responsibilities and procedures of the different entities;
- feedback and grievance redress mechanisms to enable stakeholders to make complaints and seek redress related to safeguards; and
- a safeguards information system (SIS) to provide information on how safeguards are addressed and respected.

In this context, safeguards in general are understood to be policies and measures to protect from harm, and also to ‘do good’ in the case of the Cancun safeguards. The UNFCCC Cancun Agreement defines safeguards at international level and for operationalization they need to be clarified at country level to reflect the country’s context and the specific risks and opportunities of the country’s REDD+ strategy. The actual safeguards at country level are the country’s policies, laws and regulations which ensure that the Cancun safeguards are ‘addressed’. These policies, laws and regulations are implemented through institutions, processes and procedures which ensure that the Cancun safeguards are ‘respected’.

The ‘Country Safeguards Approach’ ensures that relevant policies, laws and regulations, implemented and reinforced through effective institutions processes and procedures, informed by a safeguards information system and strengthened by a feedback and grievance redress mechanism, together, effectively address the risks and opportunities of the REDD+ strategy and activities in compliance with UNFCCC decisions related to the Cancun safeguards.
In summary, the CSA identifies and implements the country’s own safeguards that address the specific risks and opportunities of the country’s REDD+ strategy and the country context, through a country-led and -owned approach. The CSA builds on and strengthens the country’s existing legal and institutional frameworks and information systems.

Based on the experience of the REDD+ SES Initiative, the following processes are likely to be useful for the development of a CSA:

- **Define the goals of the CSA** – Considering the risks and opportunities of the REDD+ strategy, and the country context, what are safeguards expected to achieve? A participatory process to develop a country-specific interpretation or clarification of the Cancun safeguards can be useful at this stage.

- **Identify/strengthen policies, laws and regulations** – How do existing PLRs address the goals of the CSA and the country-specific interpretation or clarification of the Cancun safeguards? How do existing institutions, processes and procedures ensure effective implementation of the PLRs? What new PLRs are needed and what is the process to develop them? Is there a need to develop ‘other safeguards’ to support existing PLRs, such as procedures, norms and standards for REDD+ activities, particularly in the short to medium term before PLRs can be revised? How do institutional capacities need to be strengthened?

- **Identify/develop the safeguards information system** – What are the objectives of the SIS to provide information for what purposes? What existing systems provide relevant information related to the country-specific interpretation/clarification of safeguards? What are the gaps and how can they be filled? What are appropriate institutional arrangements? A participatory process to collecting and reviewing safeguards information can strengthen credibility and accuracy of the information and promote effective use of the safeguards information to strengthen the REDD+ strategy and safeguards.

- **Identify/develop a feedback and grievance redress mechanism** – What PLRs can grievances be raised against? What existing grievance mechanisms could be used for REDD+? Do they need to be strengthened or new ones developed, ensuring a transparent, accessible, fair and efficient response to stakeholders?

Different pathways may be taken to define and strengthen the CSA. A potential process is depicted in Figure 2 below. The proposed processes may be undertaken in parallel or at different speeds, and may be combined or organized differently. The processes will be more interconnected than depicted in this simplified diagram.

---

**Figure 2. Potential processes and considerations for the development of a country safeguards approach**
1.3 Evolution of the REDD+ SES Initiative

The REDD+ SES Initiative was started in 2009 to develop voluntary best-practice standards to support effective implementation and credible reporting on safeguards for government-led REDD+ programs. REDD+ SES guidance and tools were developed through a transparent and inclusive multi-stakeholder process from 2009. The aim was to create a framework that countries/jurisdictions could use on a voluntary basis to demonstrate high social and environmental performance of a government-led REDD+ program. The initial focus was on development of principles, criteria and a framework for indicators that could be adapted to the country context through a country-led, multi-stakeholder process. As international policy for REDD+ safeguards developed to emphasize a country-led approach, the Initiative evolved considerably from the initial promotion of voluntary standards for REDD+ to become ones of leaders in providing support for a country-led approach to REDD+ safeguards (see country support section below). Greater emphasis was placed on adoption of good practices for a transparent, multi-stakeholder process at country-level as defined in the Guidelines for the Use of REDD+ SES at Country Level. The Initiative has provided a dynamic exchange and learning platform to support South-South exchanges among government and civil society organizations for the identification and dissemination of good practices for safeguards, for multi-stakeholder approaches and for development and implementation for CSA.

Up to 2015, seventeen countries/jurisdictions have participated in the Initiative, using the REDD+ SES principles, criteria and indicator framework and the multi-stakeholder process guidelines of the REDD+ SES in different ways, either as good practice guidance, as the basis for their SIS, or as a quality assurance standard. Although countries/jurisdictions have been using the principle, criteria and indicator framework and the multi-stakeholder process guidelines in different ways, the common denominator has been strong commitment to a high level of participation and transparency, and to a comprehensive approach to REDD+ safeguards.

Goal of the REDD+ SES Initiative

To support the development and implementation of effective social and environmental safeguards for government-led strategies and action plans for REDD+ and related low-emissions land use to make a substantial contribution to human rights, poverty reduction and biodiversity conservation goals while avoiding social or environmental harm

The REDD+ SES is an initiative of the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA), a partnership of NGOs (CARE, Conservation International, Rainforest Alliance, The Nature Conservancy and Wildlife Conservation Society). The Initiative has been hosted by CARE and managed by the CCBA secretariat based at Conservation International with technical support from the Proforest Initiative. The Initiative is overseen by an International Steering Committee of representatives from governments, multilateral organizations, Indigenous and Community organizations, social and environmental NGOs and private sector organizations, mostly from countries where REDD+ activities will be implemented. The main funding for the initiative has been provided by the David and Lucile Packard Foundation (2009), the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation (2010-2011) and the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad, 2012-2015).

1 State of Acre, State of Mato Grosso, State of Amazonas in Brazil; Ecuador; Chile; Costa Rica; Democratic Republic of Congo; Guatemala; Honduras; Province of Central Kalimantan and Province of East Kalimantan in Indonesia; Liberia; States of the Yucatan Peninsula and State of Jalisco in Mexico; Nepal; Region of San Martin in Peru; Tanzania.
1.4 Why conduct an outcome evaluation?

Outcome evaluation focuses on identifying and understanding changes in behavior of key actors that constitute an important step towards achieving desired impacts. In a linear results chain, inputs enable activities that produce outputs which lead to outcomes and then impacts. In complex systems, such as changing land use under REDD+ and simultaneously meeting development goals through the development and application of safeguards, behavior changes are a key step to lasting impacts, but are usually influenced by many factors and not just by the activities of a single project.

The outcome harvesting approach used for this evaluation collects evidence of what has been achieved, and works backwards to determine what factors contributed to the change. This approach helps to understand the process of change and how each outcome contributes to this change, and is especially suited for complex situations where relations of cause and effect are not fully understood. It can provide evidence of achievements and also help to understand the significance of the changes, and the contribution of various factors, including, in this case, the REDD+ SES Initiative.

Box 3. Definition of Outcomes

Outcomes are a change in the behavior, relationships, action, activities, policies or practices of an individual, group, community, organization or institution.

Box 4. Definitions of participatory, transparent and comprehensive

The following definitions are used in relation to a country safeguards approach in the context of this report

**Participatory** – enabling inclusive participation of civil society with government and other relevant stakeholders in developing and using the CSA, including all relevant types of civil society and government stakeholders. This interpretation of participatory is sometimes referred to as multi-stakeholder.

**Transparent** – making relevant safeguards information accessible to all relevant stakeholders.

**Comprehensive** – covering all relevant safeguards issues, considering the existence of safeguards in policies, laws and regulations and the extent of their implementation.

---

1.5 Objectives of the outcome evaluation

- To provide evidence of progress and early results related to adopting a participatory, transparent and comprehensive country safeguards approach in ten countries/jurisdictions that are:
  o strengthening safeguards for REDD+ and related low emissions land use;
  o strengthening REDD+ strategies and activities to deliver greater emissions reductions and non-carbon benefits; and
  o scaling up finance for REDD+.
- To encourage wider adoption of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards for REDD+ and related low-emissions land use.
- To understand the contribution of the REDD+ SES Initiative and other factors to the progress and early results related to adopting a participatory, transparent and comprehensive country safeguards approach in ten countries/jurisdictions.

The evaluation focused on identifying the changes in key actors in three domains of change:

- government support for strong and comprehensive safeguards,
- civil society engagement for strong and comprehensive safeguards,
- government and civil society joint support for strong and comprehensive safeguards.

This included changes in behavior that facilitated the adoption of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards, and also changes that resulted in the definition of stronger and more comprehensive safeguards (policies, laws, regulations and procedures) and their more effective implementation, as well as changes beyond the country safeguards approach resulting from adoption of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards.

The evaluation does not, however, look for evidence of improvements in the social and environmental performance of the REDD+ strategies and actions (i.e. impacts) that might be attributed to adopting a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to REDD+ safeguards since it is premature to expect a pattern of impacts during this relatively early stage in the development and implementation of REDD+.

The outcome evaluation did not only collect outcomes that were influenced by the REDD+ SES Initiative, although whether that influence existed and the nature of the influence was explored in each case.

1.6 Structure of the report

This report first lays out the methods used to harvest and analyze outcomes in ten countries and then presents the results of the progress and outcomes in Guatemala, including the full outcome descriptions, supporting information and analysis. The Spanish version of this report is available on www.redd-standards.org.

2. Methods

2.1 Approach used to ‘harvest’ the outcomes

The evaluation was conducted in a participatory manner through interviews and document review using the Outcome Harvesting method, adapted for this evaluation with the assistance of Richard Smith of the Proforest Initiative. Informants were asked to provide:

1. **An outcome description** – A specific change in behavior related to adoption of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards, i.e. who changed what, when and where?
2. **The significance** – What was the importance or significance of the change described in the outcome?
3. **The contribution** – What were the main factors contributing to the change described in the outcome? Has the REDD+ SES Initiative contributed to the outcome? In what ways?

The outcomes were mostly developed through an iterative process where written outcome descriptions, significance and contribution statements were developed from informant interviews or knowledge of Initiative personnel and shared with the informants for validation. The outcomes were classified by the REDD+ SES team (see section 2.4) and the classifications were reviewed and approved by the informants. The detailed outcomes table this report provides the sources and evidence for each outcome description, and also for the significance and the contribution where these were collected from different sources.
2.2 Substantiation

As far as possible, outcomes generated by different actors were shared with other relevant actors who were asked to give their comments about the accuracy of the outcome description, and their views on the significance and the contribution. This formed a process of substantiation.

2.3 Timeline and process for collection of outcomes

The outcome evaluation started during a participatory session with members of the safeguards facilitation team from Guatemala at the annual REDD+ SES Exchange & Learning workshop in Nepal in April 2015. Further outcomes and clarifications were collected through additional interviews via skype and phone calls by Andrea Quesada, independent consultant, with support from Aurélie Lhumeau and Joanna Durbin of the REDD+ SES Secretariat in September and October 2015.
2.4 Classification of outcomes

Adoption of a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive approach

The outcomes were classified into four levels related to adoption of a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive approach:

1. **Enable** – Outcomes that create favorable conditions for a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive country safeguards approach but do not contribute explicitly and directly to enhancing participation, transparency and/or comprehensiveness in the development or implementation of the country safeguards approach.

2. **Demonstrate** – Outcomes that contribute explicitly and directly to the development of a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive country safeguards approach but not to its implementation.

3. **Institutionalize** – Outcomes that are expected to be sustained in the longer term and contribute to the implementation of a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive country safeguards approach. These changes are considered to be sustainable. Since the country safeguards approach is necessarily government-led, a change in civil society governance structures or participation could only be classified as institutionalize if there is some official government endorsement of the change, recognizing the civil society role in implementation of the safeguards approach.

4. **Result from** - Outcomes that have resulted from the adoption of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive country safeguards approach, that may contribute to REDD+ strategies, actions and impacts or also beyond REDD+. These go beyond a change in adoption of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards.

It is important to note that:

- Outcomes classified as Enable have not been further classified a-i since they only indirectly affect the country safeguards approach.
- To be classified as Demonstrate or Institutionalize the outcome must have contributed to a) a more participatory, and/or b) a more transparent and/or c) a more comprehensive approach to safeguards.

Contribution to a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach

- **a) more participatory** - Outcomes that correspond to a more inclusive participation of civil society with government, or changes that include more different types of civil society actors or changes that include more different levels (e.g. local and national) or types of government department. This interpretation of participatory is sometimes referred to as multi-stakeholder.

- **b) more transparent** - Outcomes that make more safeguards information more accessible to more different kinds of stakeholders.

- **c) more comprehensive** - Outcomes that lead to the country safeguards approach and/or the safeguards information system i) being broader in scope of issue covered or ii) extending performance monitoring beyond existence of safeguards in policies to implementation.

- **d) change in governance structures** - Outcomes that constitute a change in formal or informal arrangements that define which people and organizations influence the process of development and/or implementation of the country safeguards approach.

- **e) change in policies, laws and regulations** - Outcomes that correspond to a change in the drafting, adoption and/or revision of policies, laws and regulations linked to the adoption of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards.

- **f) change in strategies and action plans** - Outcomes that correspond to a change in government-led strategies and action plans linked to the adoption of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards.

- **g) increased funding** - Outcomes that correspond to an increase in funding.

- **h) advocacy to bring about further change** - Outcomes that relate to civil society promoting the adoption of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards.

- **i) stronger commitment/leadership** - Outcomes that strengthen government and/or civil society endorsement and taking initiative towards adoption of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards.
**Contribution to Cancun safeguards**

Outcomes were classified according to their contribution to a change in the development, policy or implementation of any specific UNFCCC REDD+ safeguards in the country:

a. Actions complement or are consistent with the objectives of national forest programs and relevant international conventions and agreements;

b. Transparent and effective national forest governance structures, taking into account national legislation and sovereignty;

c. Respect for the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities, by taking into account relevant international obligations, national circumstances and laws, and noting that the United Nations General Assembly has adopted the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples;

d. The full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, in particular indigenous peoples and local communities;

e. Actions are consistent with the conservation of natural forests and biological diversity, ensuring that the REDD+ actions are not used for the conversion of natural forests, but are instead used to incentivize the protection and conservation of natural forests and their ecosystem services, and to enhance other social and environmental benefits;

f. Actions to address the risks of reversals;

g. Actions to reduce displacement of emissions

**Actors that change behaviour**

Outcomes were classified according to the importance or significance of the change described in the outcome for

i. Building support from government for strong, comprehensive safeguards

ii. Engaging civil society for strong, comprehensive safeguards

iii. Strengthening government and civil society joint support strong and comprehensive safeguards

**Contribution of the REDD+ SES Initiative**

When the REDD+ SES Initiative contributed to the outcome, the type of contribution was classified as follows:

P Following guidelines of the REDD+ SES Initiative that promote a participatory, transparent process to ensure safeguards are addressed and respected and to provide information on safeguards

I Using the REDD+ SES principles, criteria and indicators as a framework for comprehensive treatment of safeguards

$ Funding from the REDD+ SES Initiative

A Technical assistance from the REDD+ SES Secretariat

X Exchange with and learning from actors in other countries facilitated by REDD+ SES Initiative
2.5 Limitations in the collection of outcomes and their interpretation

The outcome harvesting approach adopted for this evaluation was conducted in a participatory manner. The outcomes were identified by informants in each country who have been involved in REDD+ strategies and activities and, in most cases, also in the country safeguards approach. They identified outcomes that they consider to have been significant related to the adoption of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach. They also provided their views on the significance of the outcomes and on what factors had contributed. This approach enabled the identification of an important set of outcomes in each country that can provide evidence and illustrate pathways of the progress and results of a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards, without necessarily providing a complete and comprehensive picture.

The different context in each country/jurisdiction means that outcomes considered important in one country may not have been identified as outcomes in another country. For example, in Acre and Tanzania the government decision to develop a country safeguards approach was identified as an outcome, but not in other countries/jurisdictions despite there probably having been such as decision. The outcomes are not outputs and their mapping does not track all the milestones in development of a country safeguards approach, but only changes of behavior of key stakeholders that were considered important by those identifying the outcomes.

For a particular country/jurisdiction, differences in the number of outcomes found in each category are not a robust guide to the importance or otherwise of a particular category of outcome. Equally, the number of outcomes in different categories cannot be easily compared across countries/jurisdictions. For instance, in some countries/jurisdictions, the participation of a particular stakeholder group is a separate outcome, such as Indigenous Peoples in Peru or in Acre, but in others such as Nepal, participation of several different marginalized civil society groups are included in one outcome. The outcomes illustrate changes and help to understand the ways that changes have occurred in different countries/jurisdictions but cannot be compared quantitatively across countries/jurisdictions.

Due to constraints of time and resources, many of the outcomes were collected through email exchanges and skype or telephone discussions. It was not possible to engage physically with all potential informants. This means that the collection of outcomes was not exhaustive and some may have been missed. In most cases, the collection of outcomes was facilitated by the REDD+ SES secretariat which may have led to greater reporting of the outcomes to which the REDD+ SES Initiative contributed and fewer outcomes supported by other processes. There may also have been some variations in the ways outcomes were described due to slight variations in the approach used by the different members of the REDD+ SES secretariat in different countries/jurisdictions.

The credibility of outcomes was enhanced firstly through verification of outcome descriptions with outcome sources and, secondly, through substantiation i.e. checking outcome descriptions with written sources and/or independent actors. In all cases, the informants have reviewed and approved the final formulation of the outcome descriptions, their significance and the contributions. Lastly, informants went on record with their outcome description, thereby enhancing its credibility by association.

There was limited substantiation in several countries/jurisdictions, such as in East Kalimantan and in Nepal. Wherever possible, evidence was documented and a link is provided to support the outcome in the detailed outcomes tables, but this was not always possible and in many cases the outcomes represent opinions of the people interviewed.

The evaluation did not, as would be the case with an evaluation focused only on the effectiveness of the Initiative, seek views or to make a judgement on the merits of the Initiative and the relative significance of its contributions to observed changes. The evaluation did seek to identify which outcomes the Initiative contributed to and how, allowing some conclusions to be drawn about the relevance of the Initiative and how its relevance was sustained despite the significant changes in context.

Despite these caveats, we conclude that the outcomes represent an important and sufficiently credible collection of results, identified as significant by key actors within the countries/jurisdictions, and can provide clear evidence of the progress and results of adopting a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards.
3. Progress and results in Guatemala

REDD+ in Guatemala and development of a country safeguards approach

In 2009, the first National Climate Change Policy was drafted in Guatemala and a Climate Change Law was drafted, that was finally approved in September 2013. The Government of Guatemala had taken an interest in a REDD+ since 2008 and started to develop REDD+ readiness activities in 2009 at national level. Options for the REDD+ Strategy include strengthening the economic instruments for the Forest Law (national forest incentive program) and for Guatemala’s Protected Area System (SINAP). The latter includes development of four early REDD+ initiatives including GuateCarbon in Petén Department that has spurred much of the progress on REDD+ at the subnational and national level.

Since 2012, the government and partners in Guatemala have been using REDD+ SES tools and guidance to develop a country approach to safeguards. In July 2012, a facilitation team composed of the Ministry of Environment, Rainforest Alliance, CARE, the Inter-American Development Bank, the National Commission for Protected Areas, Sotzil and IUCN was created to facilitate the process of developing a country approach to safeguards with stakeholder participation.

To ensure strong stakeholder participation, a National Safeguards Committee was created in October 2012 with representatives from eight government sectors and non-government stakeholders including Indigenous Peoples, the National Alliance of Community Forest Organizations, women’s groups, academia, environmental NGOs and the private sector. The committee oversees and provides legitimacy to the design and implementation of the country approach to safeguards. In 2015, the Government of Guatemala formally recognized the National Safeguards Committee as a multi-sectoral group that accompanies the design and monitoring of the implementation of the National REDD+ Safeguards Approach and changed its name to the National Multi-sectoral Committee on REDD+ Safeguards.

In 2015, as part of the progress towards the elaboration of the country safeguards approach, various forest governance platforms conducted an interpretation of the seven Cancun safeguards for REDD+ and identified principles, objectives, indicators and legal and compliance frameworks for each of the REDD+ safeguards. This draft was validated in March 2016 during a national workshop on progress of preparation of the REDD+ Strategy.
Timeline and status of outcomes related to a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards in Guatemala

### 2012
1. Government establishes a multi-stakeholder National Safeguards Committee for REDD+  
   - 3 P $ A  
2. Inter-agency coordination ensures draft National REDD+ Strategy and ER-PIN include safeguards  
   - 2 P A  
5. Non-governmental stakeholders participate actively in the safeguards process  
   - 3 P $ A  
7. Government, NGOs and donors form a facilitation team for the safeguards process  
   - 2 P A  
8. National Safeguards Committee members participate actively in developing safeguards approach  
   - 3 P I A

### 2013
3. Inter-agency coordination includes respect for safeguards in climate change law  
   - 3 P A

### 2014
4. Government finance, gender and Indigenous Peoples agencies participate in national safeguards approach  
   - 2 P  
6. Indigenous groups from different regions participate actively in the safeguards process  
   - 3 P  
9. National Climate Change Council establishes a team to work on REDD+ safeguards  
   - 3 P $ A

### 2015
10. Government and civil society transition to a National Multi-sectoral Committee on REDD+ Safeguards  
    - 3 P  
11. Forest governance platforms develop first draft of National Safeguard Approach  
    - 2 I  
12. National Multi-sectoral Committee and facilitation team involve PINPEP beneficiaries network in safeguards process  
    - 3 X  
13. National Multi-sectoral Committee includes gender and Indigenous Peoples issues in safeguards approach  
    - 2 P I X

Key Actor that changes behaviour:
- government
- civil society
- joint government and civil society

What the change represents:
1 = enabling  
2 = demonstration  
3 = institutionalization  
4 = result from - adoption of a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive approach to safeguards

Contribution of REDD+ SES Initiative:
- P = process guidelines  
- I = principles, criteria, indicators  
- $ = funding  
- A = technical advice  
- X = exchange
Findings related to the significance of the outcomes

Thirteen outcomes were identified related to the adoption of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards in Guatemala, of which 4 were changes by government, 2 were changes by civil society and 7 were changes by government and civil society together.

The development of a country safeguards approach in Guatemala started in 2012 with the creation of a facilitation team composed of four government agencies as well as the indigenous organization Sotzil and also NGOs (Rainforest Alliance and CARE) and a donor (Inter-American Development Bank) (outcome 7). In other countries, the facilitation team is often composed of one government department and one, or sometimes two, NGOs, but in Guatemala they found that the inclusion of so many organizations helped to strengthen collaboration between the government and local and international NGOs and also a key donor for REDD+ readiness activities, and fostered a shared multi-stakeholder ownership of the safeguards process. This led to creation of a multi-stakeholder National Safeguards Committee for REDD+ in 2012 (1), instead of a committee composed only of government. Up to 2012, few non-governmental stakeholders had been involved in development of REDD+ policies and strategies, and the creation of this committee created an opportunity for groups such as the National Alliance of Community Forest Organizations, women’s groups, academia, environmental NGOs and private sector organizations to get involved in REDD+ safeguards from the beginning (5). All the members of the facilitation team and the National Safeguards Committee started to participate actively in the development of the country safeguards approach from 2012 (8).

From 2014, when consultations on safeguards issues were held for the strategic environmental and social assessment (SESA) under the Readiness Preparation Proposal, different government agencies for finance, gender and Indigenous Peoples started to participate actively in the safeguards process (4). Also, Indigenous Peoples from Central and South West regions started to participate actively in meetings of the Safeguards Committee (6). Including indigenous representatives from different regions helped to inject a diversity of realities and opinions into the reflections on safeguards, and helped to build the capacity of these stakeholders so that they could get involved and monitor REDD+ activities in their regions.

In 2015, the National Safeguards Committee was renamed the National Multi-sectoral Committee on REDD+ Safeguards which brought formal recognition as a multi-stakeholder body and strengthened its institutionalization (10). In 2015, as part of the progress towards the elaboration of the country safeguards approach, various forest governance platforms (Interinstitutional Coordination Group – GCI; the national multi-sectoral REDD+ Safeguards committee, the Forest and other land uses Mapping Group – GiMBUT; the REDD+ Implementers Group – GIREDDED+; representatives from the public sector, community organizations from 48 Districts, international cooperation agencies, and others) conducted an interpretation of the seven Cancun safeguards for REDD+ and identified principles (based on REDD+ SES principles), objectives, indicators and legal and compliance framework for each of the REDD+ safeguards. This draft was validated in March 2016 during a national workshop to ion preparation of the REDD+ Strategy, including an indicator matrix for each safeguard (11). The stakeholders made sure that gender and Indigenous Peoples’ issues were addressed (13). The facilitation team and the committee also invited a beneficiaries network of one of the National Incentives Programs, PINPEP, a key group that had not been involved previously (12).

As a result of being involved in the safeguards process through the facilitation team and the National Safeguards Committee, the members of the inter-agency coordination (MARN, INAB, CONAP and MAGA) contributed to ensure that safeguards components were included in the draft of the National REDD+ Strategy in 2012, and in the subsequent Emissions Reduction Program Idea Note (ER-PIN) (2) and also in the Climate Change Law that was drafted in 2013 (3).

The National Climate Change Council was established by decree in 2013 and is composed of government, civil society and private sector organizations including representatives from MARN, MAGA, Ministry of Energy and Mines, Ministry of Communications, infrastructure and Housing, National Coordination for the Reduction of Disasters, indigenous organizations, local communities organizations, Committee of commercial, industrial and finance associations, Industry Chamber, Agriculture Chamber, ANAM, AGAAI, ASOREMA, University of San Carlos, and Private Universities. The National Climate Change Council established a team to work on adaptation and mitigation safeguards in late 2014, which ensures that safeguards will be given attention and go beyond REDD+ (9).
Outcome mapping

The outcome mapping shows the linkages between the identified outcomes related to the adoption of a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards.

Outcome classification

1. **Enable** - Outcomes that create favorable conditions for a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive country safeguards approach.

   1. Government establishes National Safeguards Committee for REDD+ 2012

2. **Demonstrate** - Outcomes that contribute explicitly and directly to the development of a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive country safeguards approach.

   2. Inter-agency coordination ensures draft Strategy and ER-PIN includes safeguards 2012

   3. Inter-agency coordination includes respect for safeguards in climate change law 2013

   4. Government finance, gender and IPs agencies participate in safeguards process 2014

   5. Non-governmental stakeholders participate actively in safeguards process 2012

   6. Indigenous groups from different regions participate actively 2014

   7. Government, NGOs and donors form facilitation team 2012

   8. National Safeguards Committee members participate actively in safeguards process 2012

   9. National Climate Change Council establishes a team to work on safeguards 2014

   10. Government and civil society transition to a National Multi-sectoral committee on REDD+ safeguards 2015

3. **Institutionalize** - Outcomes that are expected to be sustained in the longer term and contribute to the implementation of a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive country safeguards approach.

   11. Forest governance platforms develop first draft of country safeguards approach 2015

   12. National Multi-sectorial Committee and facilitation team involve PINPEP beneficiaries network 2015

   13. National Multi-sectoral Committee includes gender and IPs issues in safeguards 2015

4. **Result from** - Outcomes that have resulted from the adoption of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive country safeguards approach.

   1. Government establishes National Safeguards Committee for REDD+ 2012

   2. Inter-agency coordination ensures draft Strategy and ER-PIN includes safeguards 2012

   3. Inter-agency coordination includes respect for safeguards in climate change law 2013

   4. Government finance, gender and IPs agencies participate in safeguards process 2014

   5. Non-governmental stakeholders participate actively in safeguards process 2012

   6. Indigenous groups from different regions participate actively 2014

   7. Government, NGOs and donors form facilitation team 2012

   8. National Safeguards Committee members participate actively in safeguards process 2012

   9. National Climate Change Council establishes a team to work on safeguards 2014

   10. Government and civil society transition to a National Multi-sectoral committee on REDD+ safeguards 2015

   11. Forest governance platforms develop first draft of country safeguards approach 2015

   12. National Multi-sectorial Committee and facilitation team involve PINPEP beneficiaries network 2015

   13. National Multi-sectoral Committee includes gender and IPs issues in safeguards 2015

---

*Link an outcome that contributes to 3 or more outcomes*

*Link between two outcomes*

*No contribution of the REDD+ SES Initiative*
Key outcomes that contributed to several other outcomes:

- The creation of the facilitation team (7) by government, NGOs and donors led to 5 key outcomes (1, 3, 2, 11, 12) that were instrumental in leading to the majority of outcomes.
- The establishment of the National Safeguards Committee for REDD+ (1) contributed to 5 different outcomes (2, 3, 5, 8, 10). In particular, it led to the inclusion of safeguards in the climate change law (3) and the creation of a climate change team to work on safeguards (9).
- The active participation of National Safeguards Committee members (8) and of non-governmental stakeholders in the safeguards process (5) led to the transition of the National Safeguards Committee to a National Multi-sectoral Committee (10), the participation of Indigenous Peoples from various regions (6) and the inclusion of important government agencies in the process (4).
- The transition from Safeguards Committee to a National Multi-sectoral Committee led to several further outcomes (11, 12, 13) including the development of the first draft of the country safeguards approach (11).

Outcomes that strengthen development, policy change and implementation of the Cancun safeguards

The following outcomes in Guatemala helped to strengthen development, policy change and implementation of the UNFCCC Cancun safeguards through changes expected to endure (classified as 3. Institutionalize or 4. Results from).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short outcome description</th>
<th>Cancun safeguard(s)</th>
<th>Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Government establishes a multi-stakeholder National Safeguards Committee for REDD+ (8 sectors)</td>
<td>c - Respect for the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities</td>
<td>Within REDD+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b - Transparent and effective forest governance structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d - The full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Inter-agency coordination includes respect for safeguards in climate change law</td>
<td>a - Consistency and complementarity with national forest programmes and international agreements</td>
<td>REDD+ and beyond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b - Transparent and effective forest governance structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c - Respect for the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d - The full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e - Conservation of natural forests and biological diversity, no conversion of natural forests, incentive for the protection and conservation of natural forests and their ecosystem services, and to enhance other social and environmental benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Non-governmental stakeholders participate actively in the safeguards process</td>
<td>b - Transparent and effective forest governance structures</td>
<td>Within REDD+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d - The full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Indigenous Peoples from different regions participate actively in the safeguards process</td>
<td>b - Transparent and effective forest governance structures</td>
<td>Within REDD+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c - Respect for the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d - The full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings on the factors contributing to the outcomes including the REDD+ SES Initiative

The REDD+ SES Initiative made an important contribution to all the outcomes in Guatemala, in part because the government started to initiate the development of a country safeguards approach with the creation of a multi-stakeholder safeguards committee and a facilitation team through a capacity-building workshop on safeguards supported by the REDD+ SES Initiative in 2012 (1, 7). In particular, the REDD+ SES process guidelines contributed to 11 out of 13 outcomes. For example, the criteria for membership and the role of the safeguards committee were based on the REDD+ SES guidelines. Also, efforts were made to include a more comprehensive representation of Indigenous Peoples (6), and to ensure that gender and Indigenous Peoples’ issues were included in the safeguards approach (13) in part because these aspects are highlighted in the REDD+ SES Guidelines. The capacity building workshops and technical advice from REDD+ SES Secretariat in 2012 and 2013 helped to build capacity and confidence of the facilitation team and the safeguards committee so that they could lead the safeguards process (5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13) and also encouraged the government members of the inter-agency coordination to ensure that safeguards were included in the preparation of the national REDD+ strategy (2) and this helped to include these requirements for the forest sector in the climate change law and for the climate funding mechanisms (3). In contrast, the REDD+ SES principles, criteria and indicators only contributed to one outcome, an interpretation of the Cancun safeguards as part of the elaboration of the country safeguards approach, including the interpretation and adoption of REDD+ SES principles for safeguards and helping to define the other components of the country safeguards approach (objectives, indicators, legal, institutional and compliance frameworks) (11). The inclusion of project beneficiaries in the safeguards process resulted, in part, from participation of a member of the facilitation team in a REDD+ SES Exchange and Learning workshop and from learning about the experiences of safeguards processes in other countries (12).
Outcomes of a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards in Guatemala

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short description</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Significance for</th>
<th>Factors contributing to the outcome and contribution of REDD+ SES Initiative</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Substantiation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government support for strong and comprehensive safeguards</strong></td>
<td>In 2012, the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MARN) established the National Safeguards Committee, to accompany the design of the REDD+ National Safeguards Approach. The committee included representatives from the government, local governments, Indigenous Peoples, the National Alliance of Community Forests Organizations, women’s groups, academia, environmental NGOs and private sector.</td>
<td>Initially, it was thought that the National Safeguards Committee would involve mainly government representatives but after an Introductory Workshop, and with support of the facilitation team, a multi-sectorial Safeguards Committee was established that enables key stakeholders groups to formally participate in government related REDD+ processes by overseeing the design and implementation of the national safeguards approach.</td>
<td>REDD+ SES supported the Introductory workshop on environmental and social safeguards in collaboration with Asociación Sotzil, RainForest Alliance, CARE International and the Interamerican Bank (IDB) where the importance of establishing a multi-sectorial committee was emphasized. The criteria to establish the safeguards committee were based on the REDD+ SES guidelines.</td>
<td>Omar Samayo</td>
<td>IADB and member of the Facilitation Team - 13 October 2015 via Skype</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Government establishes a multi-stakeholder National Safeguards Committee for REDD+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change that:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Institutionalizes How:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) more participatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) more comprehensive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) governance structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthens Cancun safeguards: b, c, d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension: within REDD+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change that:</th>
<th>2. Demonstrates How:</th>
<th>Change that:</th>
<th>3. Institutionalizes How:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-agency coordination ensures draft National REDD+ Strategy and ER-PIN include safeguards</td>
<td>a) more participatory c) more comprehensive f) Strategies and action plans i) leadership</td>
<td>Inter-agency coordination includes respect for safeguards in climate change law</td>
<td>c) more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| From 2012, the institutions of the inter-agency coordination (MARN, INAB, CONAP, and MAGA) on the National Safeguards Committee included safeguards in the draft National REDD+ Strategy and in Guatemala’s Emissions Reductions Program Idea Note (ER-PIN). | The inclusion of safeguards in the draft REDD+ strategy and ER-PIN demonstrates the government’s commitment to comply with UNFCCC decisions and demonstrates greater commitment from the government to ensure that social and environmental safeguards are addressed and respected in all of the REDD+ processes. | The REDD + SES Initiative provided methodological and technical support to establish this multi-stakeholder safeguards committee and the REDD+ SES Secretariat provided technical assistance to build the capacities of the members on safeguard issues. (P, A) | Roberto Chuc, CARE and member of the Facilitation Team. 13 October 2015 via Skype |

| In 2013, the institutions of the inter-agency coordination (MARN, INAB, CONAP, and MAGA and civil society representatives on the National Safeguards Committee included Article 3 on compliance with safeguards in the climate change law that was passed in 2013. | The inclusion of an article on safeguards in the climate change law demonstrated that the country recognizes the importance to include social and environmental safeguards when designing and implementing climate change programs, projects and activities related to both mitigation and adaptation. | The capacity building on safeguards, the establishment of the multi-sectoral committee and the interpretation of the Principles, Criteria and Indicators that were part of the REDD+ SES increase the understanding and commitment regarding safeguards of the | Roberto Chuc, CARE and member of the Facilitation Team. 13 October 2015 via Skype |

Ley Marco para Regular la Reducción de la

---

| comprehensive e)policies laws and regulations Strengthens Cancun safeguards: a,b,c,d,e Dimension: REDD+ and beyond | representatives from the institutions of the inter-agency coordination and civil society. This resulted not only in an increased in their understanding about safeguards, but the reasons why all programs and projects related to climate change should respect them was comprehended. (P, A) | Vulnerabilidad, la Adaptación Obligatoria ante los Efectos del Cambio Climático y la Mitigación de Gases de Efecto Invernadero DECRETO NÚMERO 7-2013

4 - Government finance, gender and Indigenous Peoples agencies participate in national safeguards approach

Change that: 2. Demonstrates How:
a) more participatory
c) more comprehensive | Since 2014, the governmental technical officers from finance, gender and Indigenous Peoples agencies participated in the SESA, ESMF, and the consultation process for safeguards. This demonstrates that Guatemala's government has recognized the importance of including different stakeholders and governmental agencies in the development of the safeguards approach. The coordination of several sectors has allowed the inclusion of a diversity of opinions, issues, and unique perspectives (for example, gender and indigenous peoples issues) and increase of ownership of REDD+ process of different governmental agencies. Initially, only the climate change units worked on REDD+ issues, but the work on safeguards has involved other governmental departments such as financial, gender, Indigenous Peoples, jurisdictional and other entities. Also, through the work on safeguards, the government recognized that it needs the technical and institutional support of different stakeholders and governmental agencies. The government has formally adopted the REDD+ SES as guidance because the initiative’s guidelines provide a clear plan to involved and respect views of multiple stakeholders. (P) | Lorena Cordova IUCN and member of the Facilitation Team. 13 October 2015 via Skype

First draft the National Safeguards Approach in Guatemala within the REDD+ National Strategy framework |

## Civil society support for strong and comprehensive safeguards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change that:</th>
<th>3. Institutionalizes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **How:** | a) more participatory  
c) more comprehensive  
d) governance structures  
Strengthens Cancun safeguards: b,d |
| **Dimension:** | Within REDD+ |
| **5 - Non-governmental stakeholders participate actively in the safeguards process** | Since 2012, non-governmental stakeholders, including Indigenous Peoples, the National Alliance of Community Forest Organizations (ANOF), women's groups, academia, environmental NGOs and private sector, decided to participate in the National Safeguards Committee and in the development of REDD+ safeguards in Guatemala. The decision of non-governmental and external stakeholders to participate in the safeguards committee has been a first and crucial step to ensure that there is collaboration between the government and civil society in REDD+ issues; as non-governmental stakeholders have been recognized as advisors with unique opinions and experiences and have been included in the decision-making processes. It also ensures that the approach, respect and compliance of safeguards properly addresses a diversity issues, it increases the ownership of processes by civil society and their trust on government-lead processes. |
| Before 2012, few non-governmental stakeholders were actively involved in the development of REDD+ processes. However, the establishment of a multi-sectorial Safeguards Committee opened an opportunity for these stakeholders to become involved in a REDD+ related process since the beginning. Guatemala’s involvement in the REDD+ SES initiative led to the establishment of a multi-sectorial National Safeguards Committee where non-governmental stakeholders can participate in an environment where the government representatives recognize and value their contributions. (P, $, A) |
| Omar Samayoa IADB and member of the Facilitation Team. Call on the 13th of October 2015 via Skype |
| First draft of the National Safeguards Approach in Guatemala within the REDD+ National Strategy framework |

<p>| <strong>6 - Indigenous peoples from different regions participate actively</strong> | From 2014, Indigenous Peoples from the Central region and Western Altiplano of Guatemala started to participate in the safeguards process. In August 2015, the initial commitment of indigenous groups from the north participated in REDD+ processes. |
| | Initially, in 2012, only indigenous groups from the north participated in REDD+ processes. |
| | Roberto Chuc, CARE and member of the Facilitation |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change that:</th>
<th>3. Institutionalizes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How:</td>
<td>a) more participatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthens:</td>
<td>b,c,d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancun safeguards:</td>
<td>b,c,d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension: Within REDD+</td>
<td>Dimension: Within REDD+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| In the safeguards process | participate in the meetings of the Safeguards Committee and contribute to the interpretation of REDD+ safeguards and the elaboration of the national safeguard approach, expanding representation beyond the northern region. | ancestral organization from 48 districts of the western altiplano started participating. Having indigenous representatives from different regions allows the possibility of hearing a diversity of realities and opinions and increasing harmony among groups. It opens an opportunity for these stakeholders to building their capacities regarding REDD+ and their safeguards in order for them to get involve and monitor REDD+ activities in their regions. | related processes as this region is where most of the REDD+ activities are implemented. Since 2012, the Indigenous Climate Change Caucus (MICC) and Sotzil, two of the members of the National Safeguards Committee have actively inviting representatives of the indigenous peoples from different regions, as an attempt to diversify the National Safeguards Committee. The establishment of the Safeguards Committee of Guatemala is based on the REDD+ SES guidelines and the guidelines provide specific recommendations to ensure the participation and representation of indigenous peoples that were adapted to the Guatemala context. (P) |

| Government and civil society joint support for strong and comprehensive safeguards | In 2012, the four institutions of the public Inter institutional Coordination Group (MARN, INAB, MARN, MAGA, INAB, CONAP. 2015. First Corroborated with information | The establishment of the facilitation team strengthens the collaboration and coordination between the | The REDD+ SES Guidelines suggest establishment of a |
2. Demonstrates How:

a) more participatory governance structures

CONAP, and MAGA) and strategic partners such as Indigenous Organization (Asociación Sotzil), NGOs (IUCN, CARE International, Rainforest Alliance) and donor (Inter-American Bank (IADB)) decided to establish a facilitation team to oversee the development of the safeguards process in Guatemala.

government, local and international NGOs and donors and strengthens the involvement of different sectors in the safeguard process as the facilitation includes organizations that are not part of the safeguards committee. The existence of this team also allowed the multi-sectorial ownership of the process to develop the safeguards and ensured that the development of the National Safeguards Approach is done based on the Cancun safeguards.

facilitation team to organize the safeguards process, such as organizing meetings of stakeholders and the safeguards committee, preparing documents, organizing national and local workshops. Guatemala’s involvement in the REDD+ SES initiative led to the establishment of the facilitation team based on the REDD+ SES guidelines. (P, A)

draft of the National Safeguards Approach in Guatemala within the framework of the REDD+ National Strategy

Since 2012, the members of the Multi Sectorial Committee and facilitation team actively participate in the development of the National Safeguards Approach and contribute to documents submitted by the MARN, actions that demonstrated the knowledge

Involving representatives from different organizations that have a proper understanding of issues and language related to safeguards and their articulation with REDD+ resulted in a comprehensive and robust process to develop safeguards that incorporate multiple social and

Since 2012, the REDD+ SES Secretariat has supported Guatemala with the development of the capacities of the Safeguards

Ayame Sosa

IADB and member of the Facilitation Team. Call on the 13 October 2015 via Skype

8 - National Safeguards Committee members and facilitation team participate actively in developing

Since 2012, the members of the Multi Sectorial Committee and facilitation team actively participate in the development of the National Safeguards Approach and contribute to documents submitted by the MARN, actions that demonstrated the knowledge

Involving representatives from different organizations that have a proper understanding of issues and language related to safeguards and their articulation with REDD+ resulted in a comprehensive and robust process to develop safeguards that incorporate multiple social and

Since 2012, the REDD+ SES Secretariat has supported Guatemala with the development of the capacities of the Safeguards

Ayame Sosa

IADB and member of the Facilitation Team. Call on the 13 October 2015 via Skype

Members of the Facilitation Team

13 October 2015 via Skype

shared in call with:

Amarilis Gomez (Sotzil)

Sergio Dionisio (Rainforest Alliance)

Ayme Sosa (IADB)

Roberto Chuc, (CARE)

Lorena Cordova, (UICN)

Omar Samayoa (IADB)

Mónica Barillas (CONAP)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safeguards approach</th>
<th>and capacities they gained on REDD+ safeguards.</th>
<th>Environmental issues and involve many stakeholders. The process contributes to properly addressing Cancun Safeguards and fulfilling World Bank’s requirements.</th>
<th>Committee regarding safeguards issues. The capacity building process included workshops and discussions, which were based on the training methodology, the information included in the PCI, and the case studies proposed by the REDD+ SES. The workshops and meetings to discuss the REDD+ SES principles and criteria provided Safeguards Committee members with spaces to understand safeguards and safeguard in depth. (P, I, A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**9 - National Climate Change Council establishes a team to work on REDD+ safeguards**

3. **Institutionalizes**

Since late 2014, the technical teams in the National Climate Change Council, which includes representatives from MARN, MAGA, Ministry of Energy and Mines, Ministry of Communications, infrastructure and Housing, National Coordination for the Reduction The National Climate Change Council was established by national decree in 2013. The law mentions that the Council will regulate and supervise all policies, funds, strategies and programs related to mitigation and adaptation. This mandate for the Council is general and the fact that there is a specific team that focuses Capacity building process that were part of the REDD+ SES process contributed to improve the involvement of various stakeholders and

**Committee regarding safeguards issues. The capacity building process included workshops and discussions, which were based on the training methodology, the information included in the PCI, and the case studies proposed by the REDD+ SES. The workshops and meetings to discuss the REDD+ SES principles and criteria provided Safeguards Committee members with spaces to understand safeguards and safeguard in depth. (P, I, A)**

**FCPF Guatemala REDD+ Annual Report. August 2015**

**FCPF. Guatemala’s Emission Reductions Program Idea Note (ER-PIN). 2014**

**Corroborated with information shared by Ramiro Batzin, Sotzil and member of the**

---


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How:</th>
<th>In 2015, the National Safeguards Committee renamed itself as the National Multi Sectoral Committee on REDD+ Safeguards to highlight that it is a multi-sectoral group that accompanies the design, implementation and monitoring of the implementation of the REDD+ National Safeguards Approach. In 2015, the government, civil society, indigenous peoples, women’s groups and all sectors in the Committee formally recognized the Safeguards Committee as a multi stakeholder platform. The composition of the committee did not change when it was officially recognized as a multi-sectoral committee. The criteria to establish Omar Samayoa IADB and member of the Facilitation Team. Call on the 13th of October 2015 via Skype First draft of the National Safeguards Approach in Guatemala within the REDD+ National Strategy framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) more participatory d) governance structures</td>
<td>This transition to a formal multi-sectoral structure demonstrates the government’s support for the involvement civil society to develop effective and comprehensive safeguards and civil society’s commitment to contribute to governmental efforts to develop REDD+ safeguard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthens Cancun safeguards: b,d</td>
<td>Increase the awareness on the importance of having social and environmental safeguards (P, $, A).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension: REDD+ and beyond</td>
<td>Reducción de la Vulnerabilidad, la Adaptación Obligatoria ante los Efectos del Cambio Climático y la Mitigación de Gases de Efecto Invernadero DECRETO NÚMERO 7-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Disasters, indigenous organizations, local communities organizations, Committee of commercial, industrial and finance associations, Industry Chamber, Agriculture Chamber, ANAM, AGAAI, ASOREMA, University of San Carlos, and Private Universities established a specific team to work on adaptation and mitigation safeguards</td>
<td>This transition to a formal multi-sectoral structure demonstrates the government’s support for the involvement civil society to develop effective and comprehensive safeguards and civil society’s commitment to contribute to governmental efforts to develop REDD+ safeguard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Government and civil society transition to a National Multi-sectoral Committee on REDD+ Safeguards</td>
<td>In 2015, the National Safeguards Committee renamed itself as the National Multi Sectoral Committee on REDD+ Safeguards to highlight that it is a multi-sectoral group that accompanies the design, implementation and monitoring of the implementation of the REDD+ National Safeguards Approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change that: 3. Institutionalizes How: a) more participatory d) governance structures Strengthens Cancun safeguards: b,d</td>
<td>In 2015, the government, civil society, indigenous peoples, women’s groups and all sectors in the Committee formally recognized the Safeguards Committee as a multi stakeholder platform. The composition of the committee did not change when it was officially recognized as a multi-sectoral committee. The criteria to establish Omar Samayoa IADB and member of the Facilitation Team. Call on the 13th of October 2015 via Skype First draft of the National Safeguards Approach in Guatemala within the REDD+ National Strategy framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension: Within REDD+</th>
<th>the safeguards committee were based on the REDD+ SES guidelines (P)</th>
<th>Corroborated with information shared during the call with: Amarilis Gomez (Sotzil) Sergio Dionisio (Rainforest Alliance) Ayme Sosa (IADB) Roberto Chuc, (CARE) Lorena Cordova, (UICN) Omar Samayoa (IADB) Mónica Barillas (CONAP) Members of the Facilitation Team 13 October 2015 via Skype</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 - Forest governance platforms develop first draft of National Safeguards Approach</td>
<td>In 2015, forest governance platforms (Interinstitutional Coordination Group – GCI; the national multi-sectoral REDD+ Safeguards committee, the Forest and other land uses Mapping Group – GIMBUT; the REDD+ Implementers Group – GIREDD+; representatives from the public sector, the Community organizations of 48 Districts, international cooperation agencies, and others) had the knowledge and capacities to develop the first draft of the National Safeguards Approach in a workshop held in Antigua including a comprehensive country-specific interpretation of the Cancun safeguards, and identified principles (based on REDD+ SES principles), objectives, indicators and legal and compliance framework for each of the REDD+ safeguards.</td>
<td>In August 2015, Guatemala held its first national workshop to develop its national safeguards approach. The workshop was organized and facilitated by the facilitation team, funded by the USAID Regional Climate Change Programme (PRCC) and The Climate, Nature, and Communities Programme of Guatemala (CNGC). The workshop was attended by the Safeguards Committee, the Forest and other land uses Mapping Group (GIMBUT), REDD+ Implementers Group (GIREDD+), the Forests, Biodiversity and Climate Change Group (GBByCC) as well as other representatives from government,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demonstrates How: a) more participatory c) more comprehensive f) strategies and action plans</td>
<td>The 3 day workshop held in August 2015 demonstrates that the government, donors and civil society are committed to developing in a participatory manner a comprehensive National Safeguards Approach that addresses Cancun safeguards, builds on existing legal and institutional structures, considers principles, objectives and indicators for each safeguard and incorporates social and environmental issues that are relevant to the Guatemala context.</td>
<td>Omar Samayoa IADB and member of the Facilitation Team. 13 October 2015 via Skype</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First draft the National Safeguards Approach in Guatemala within the REDD+ National Strategy framework
NGOs, local organizations and indigenous peoples groups. The workshop included a preliminary analysis and interpretation of the Cancun Safeguards, the 7 REDD+ SES Principles and indicators, which also oriented the definition of the other components of the country safeguards approach (objectives, indicators, legal, institutional and compliance framework). This draft was validated in March 2016 during a national workshop to present progress of preparation of the REDD+ Strategy, including an indicator matrix for each safeguard. 

<p>| 12 - National Multi-sectoral Committee and facilitation team involve the PINPEP beneficiaries network in participation |
| In November of 2015, the facilitation team and the National Multi Sectoral Committee invited the beneficiaries network one of the National Incentives Programs PINPEP to provide input at a REDD+ safeguards approach | The facilitation team realized that other implementers REDD+ measures were not involved in REDD+ governance structures. Hence, in November the first workshop on the REDD+ Safeguards approach was organized mainly for participation in the REDD+ Exchange and Learning event in Bogor (2013), Merida (2014) and Pokhara (2015) allowed participants | Participating in the REDD+ Exchange and Learning event in Bogor (2013), Merida (2014) and Pokhara (2015) allowed participants | Corroborated with information shared by Ramiro Batzin, Sotzil and member of the Facilitation Team on 14th of January 2016. Via email and Ayme Sosa, IADB and member of the Facilitation Team on 8th of January 2016. Via email |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>safeguards process</th>
<th>workshop.</th>
<th>representatives involved in the governance platforms of the national incentives program.</th>
<th>to learn lessons from other countries and states. Discussion on specific issues related to enhanced participation, and has led to the development of specific actions to address these issues. (X)</th>
<th>member of the Facilitation Team on 14th of January 2016. Via email and Ayme Sosa, IADB and member of the Facilitation Team on 8th of January 2016. Via email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **2. Demonstrates How:**
| a) more participatory | | | | |
| Change that:
| 2. Demonstrates How:
| c) more comprehensive f) strategies and action plans | Since 2015, the National Multi-sectoral Committee and the facilitation team have ensured that Guatemala's draft National Safeguard Approach includes gender and Indigenous Peoples issues. | Properly addressing gender and Indigenous Peoples issues are crucial for the success of REDD+, as Guatemala is a cultural diverse country with multiple indigenous groups\(^9\) that live and rely on forests and where women play a crucial role in the sustainable use and conservation of these ecosystems. | Thanks to the safeguard process the different REDD+ governance platforms, including the National Multi-sectoral Safeguards Committee members have engaged in activities to address gender and Indigenous Peoples issues in the development of Guatemala's National Safeguards approach to safeguards. The work on safeguards as lead to specific actions to address | Amarilis Gomez Sotzil and member of the Facilitation Team. 13 October 2015 via Skype | Call with: Amarilis Gomez (Sotzil) Sergio Dionisio (Rainforest Alliance) Ayme Sosa (IADB) Roberto Chuc, (CARE) Lorena Cordova, (UICN) Omar Samayoa |

---

\(^9\) Guatemala is a multicultural country with three indigenous peoples and Maya, garinfunkas and Xinkas, the Maya include 22 linguistic communities
these issues; for example two workshops on gender, safeguards and REDD+ were organized, that had broad participation of local communities and indigenous peoples that implement REDD+ activities. Also, the elaboration of REDD+ indigenous safeguards and the studies proposed in the draft National Safeguards Approach to incorporate gender (USAID/PRCC-IUCN/CARE) and indigenous perspectives (USAID/CNCG-Sotzil) in the compliance of the REDD+ safeguards.

The REDD+ SES guidelines and PCI includes specific actions and considerations regarding Indigenous Peoples and gender. REDD+ SES exchange and learning and events include activities and discussions on how countries could address these issues which influenced the facilitation team. (P, I, X)