United Nations

Framework Convention on Climate Change

FCCC/ETF/TATR.1/2026/BLZ

Distr.: General
26 November 2026

English only

Technical report on the technical analysis of the technical annex to the first biennial transparency report of Belize submitted in accordance with paragraph 14 of decision 18/CMA.1 on 23 April 2026

Summary

This technical report covers the technical analysis of the technical annex submitted on a voluntary basis, in the context of results-based payments, by Belize on 23 April 2026 through its first biennial transparency report in accordance with paragraph 45 of decision 1/CP.24 and paragraph 14 of decision 18/CMA.1. The technical annex provides data and information on the activities reducing emissions from deforestation, reducing emissions from forest degradation, conservation of forest carbon stocks, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks, which are the activities included in paragraph 70 of decision 1/CP.16, and covers the same national territorial forest area as the assessed forest reference level (FRL) proposed by Belize in its modified FRL submission of January 2026.

Belize reported the results of implementing these activities for 2021–2022, which amount to 5,001,627 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO_2 eq) for 2021 and 2,926,429 t CO_2 eq for 2022 and were measured against the assessed FRL of –2,218,935 t CO_2 eq/year.

The data and information provided in the technical annex are in overall accordance with the guidelines contained in the annex to decision 14/CP.19. The technical analysis concluded that the data and information provided by Belize in the technical annex are mostly transparent and consistent with the data and information used for establishing the assessed FRL in accordance with paragraph 71(b) of decision 1/CP.16 and section II of decision 12/CP.17. This report contains the findings from the technical analysis and a few areas identified for capacity-building and future technical improvement in accordance with paragraph 14 of decision 14/CP.19.

Please recycle

Abbreviations and acronyms

2006 IPCC Guidelines	*2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*
2019 Refinement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines	*2019 Refinement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*
AD	activity data
BTR	biennial transparency report
CH_4	methane
CO_2	carbon dioxide
CO_2 eq	carbon dioxide equivalent
EF	emission factor
FREL	forest reference emission level
FRL	forest reference level
GHG	greenhouse gas
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
LULUCF	land use, land-use change and forestry
MPGs	modalities, procedures and guidelines for the transparency framework for action and support referred to in Article 13 of the Paris Agreement
MRV	measurement, reporting and verification
N_2O	nitrous oxide
NFMS	national forest monitoring system
REDD+	reducing emissions from deforestation; reducing emissions from forest degradation; conservation of forest carbon stocks; sustainable management of forests; and enhancement of forest carbon stocks (decision 1/CP.16, para. 70)
SOC	soil organic carbon
TA	technical analysis

I. Introduction, overview and summary

A. Introduction

1. This technical report covers the TA of the technical annex provided by Belize on 23 April 2026 in accordance with paragraph 45 of decision 1/CP.24 and paragraph 14 of decision 18/CMA.1 as part of its BTR1, which was submitted in accordance with paragraph 3 of decision 18/CMA.1. In the technical annex, Belize provided the data and information used for estimating its anthropogenic forest-related emissions by sources and removals by sinks, forest carbon stocks, and changes in forest carbon stock and forest area resulting from implementing REDD+ activities. The submission of the technical annex is voluntary and in the context of results-based payments in accordance with paragraph 8 of decision 14/CP.19.

2. In accordance with paragraph 14 of decision 18/CMA.1, the TA of the technical annex to the BTR is carried out concurrently with the technical expert review of the BTR referred to in Article 13, paragraph 11, of the Paris Agreement. A technical expert review team conducted the technical expert review of the information reported in the BTR1 of Belize as per the scope of the review defined in paragraph 146 of the MPGs,[1] resulting in a separate technical expert review report and its addendum.[2]

3. Belize made its first and second FRL submissions, in accordance with decision 12/CP.17, on 14 January 2020 and 10 January 2024 respectively, which were subject to technical assessment following the guidance provided in decision 13/CP.19 and its annex. As a result of the facilitative interactions with the LULUCF experts during the technical assessment, the Party provided a modified version of its latest FRL submission on 21 January 2026. The latest assessed FRL was included as one of the elements of the technical annex to its BTR1 in accordance with the guidelines contained in the annex to decision 14/CP.19. The findings from the technical assessment of that FRL are included in a separate report.[3]

4. Belize previously submitted a technical annex to its first biennial update report on 30 August 2021. The outcome of the TA thereof is contained in document FCCC/SBI/ICA/2021/TATR.1/BLZ. Previous FRL submissions, biennial update reports with technical annexes and associated technical assessment and analysis reports for the Party are available online.[4]

B. Process overview

5. The technical expert review of the BTR1 of Belize took place from 4 to 8 May 2026 as an in-country review and was undertaken by a technical expert review team drawn from the UNFCCC roster of experts on the basis of the criteria defined in paragraphs 172–182 of the MPGs. Inge G.C. Jonckheere (Belgium) and Muri Soares (Mozambique) were the LULUCF experts who undertook the TA of the technical annex in accordance with paragraphs 10–13 of decision 14/CP.19. The TA was coordinated by Keiichi Igarashi (secretariat).

6. The TA of the technical annex provided by Belize was undertaken in accordance with the procedures contained in decisions 2/CP.17, 14/CP.19 and 20/CP.19. This technical report on the TA was prepared by the LULUCF experts in accordance with paragraph 14 of decision 14/CP.19.

7. During the TA and subsequent exchanges, the LULUCF experts and Belize engaged in technical discussions, and Belize provided clarifications in response to questions raised by the LULUCF experts, in order to reach an understanding on the identification of the capacity-building needs of the Party and areas for future technical improvement. As a result of the facilitative interactions with the LULUCF experts during the TA, Belize provided a modified

[1] Decision 18/CMA.1, annex.
[2] FCCC/ETF/TERR.1/2024/BLZ and Add.1, published on 11 August 2026.
[3] FCCC/TAR/2024/BLZ, published on 17 April 2026.
[4] https://redd.unfccc.int/submissions/by-country/country_detail/blz.html.

version of its technical annex on 1 September 2026, which took into consideration the technical input of the LULUCF experts. The modifications improved the clarity and transparency of the submitted technical annex without needing to alter the values for the estimated results.

8. Following the TA of the technical annex, the LULUCF experts prepared and shared the draft technical report with Belize for its review and comments. The LULUCF experts responded to the Party's comments and incorporated them into and finalized this technical report in consultation with Belize. This technical report on the TA of the technical annex was prepared in the context of the modified technical annex submitted by the Party.

C. Summary of results

9. In paragraph 70 of decision 1/CP.16 the Conference of the Parties encouraged developing country Parties to contribute to mitigation actions in the forest sector by undertaking a number of activities, as deemed appropriate by each Party in accordance with its respective capabilities and national circumstances. In the context of results-based payments and in line with decision 12/CP.17, Belize, on a voluntary basis, proposed a national FRL covering the activities reducing emissions from deforestation, reducing emissions from forest degradation, conservation of forest carbon stocks, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks for the purpose of a technical assessment in accordance with decision 13/CP.19 and its annex. The activities are being implemented in Belize's national territory. The assessed FRL of Belize is –2,218,935 t CO_2 eq/year.

10. The Party's FRL is based on its annual average historical removals associated with the activities reducing emissions from deforestation, reducing emissions from forest degradation, conservation of forest carbon stocks, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks for the historical reference period 2011–2020. Belize reported the results of implementing the activities reducing emissions from deforestation, reducing emissions from forest degradation, conservation of forest carbon stocks, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks for 2021–2022, calculated against the FRL, which amount to carbon removals of 5,001,627 t CO_2 eq for 2021 and 2,926,429 t CO_2 eq for 2022. The table contained in annex II summarizes the main features of the results in the technical annex, with the aim of accessing results-based payments for REDD+ activities, including the results period, the assessed FRL, and the pools and gases included.

11. Belize submitted its first FRL for technical assessment in 2020.[5] The assessed FRL was 4,606,875 t CO_2 eq for 2016, 4,850,928 t CO_2 eq for 2017, 5,094,981 t CO_2 eq for 2018, 5,339,034 t CO_2 eq for 2019 and 5,583,087 t CO_2 eq for 2020 for the reference period 2001–2015. Measured against this value, Belize also submitted results amounting to 81,794 t CO_2 eq for 2016, 940,385 t CO_2 eq for 2017 and 4,580,384 t CO_2 eq for 2018, which were assessed in 2021.[6]

II. Technical analysis of the information reported in the technical annex

12. For the technical annex to the BTR1 submitted by Belize, see annex I.[7]

13. The scope of the TA is outlined in paragraph 11 of decision 14/CP.19, according to which the LULUCF experts shall analyse the extent to which:

(a) The methodologies, definitions, comprehensiveness and information provided are consistent between the assessed FRL and the results of implementing REDD+ activities;

[5] See document FCCC/TAR/2020/BLZ.
[6] See document FCCC/SBI/ICA/2021/TATR.1/BLZ.
[7] As per decision 14/CP.19, para. 14(a).

(b) The data and information provided in the technical annex are transparent, consistent, complete and accurate;

(c) The data and information provided in the technical annex are consistent with the guidelines referred to in paragraph 9 of decision 14/CP.19;

(d) The results are accurate, to the extent possible.

14. The table below describes the findings from the TA of the data, methodologies and procedures used by the developing country Party for estimating its anthropogenic forest-related emissions by sources and removals by sinks, forest carbon stocks, and changes in forest carbon stock and forest area resulting from implementing REDD+ activities within the scope of the TA outlined in paragraph 13 above.

Findings from the technical analysis of the data and information used by the developing country Party for estimating its anthropogenic forest-related emissions by sources and removals by sinks, forest carbon stocks, and changes in forest carbon stock and forest area resulting from implementing REDD+ activities

Finding ID#	*Aspect of the scope of the TA (decision 14/CP.19, para. 11)*	*Description of the issue, additional information shared by the Party during the TA and conclusions of the LULUCF experts*	*Area for future technical improvement*
1	11(a) Consistency with the guidelines in paragraph 3 of the annex to decision 14/CP.19 (consistency with the assessed FREL/FRL)	The LULUCF experts noted that Belize maintained consistency between its assessed FRL and estimated results of implementing the activities reducing emissions from deforestation, reducing emissions from forest degradation, conservation of forest carbon stocks, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in 2021–2022 with regard to the following elements: (a) Using consistent methodologies and data to generate AD on annual land use, land-use change and forest disturbances across the national territory on the basis of the same systematic sample-based land-use assessment using the Coalition for Rainforest Nations land-use assessment app and IPCC approach 3 for land representation; (b) Using consistent methodologies and data to generate EFs, in particular the same equations from IPCC guidelines and the same parameters for forest carbon stock, biomass growth and loss of biomass due to disturbances and for estimating emissions and removals caused by land conversion by forest subcategory and carbon pool; (c) Covering the same five carbon pools: above-ground biomass, below-ground biomass, deadwood, litter and SOC; (d) Covering the same gases: CO_2, CH_4 and N_2O, with CH_4 and N_2O included for biomass burning on forest land remaining forest land, and applying the same 100-year global warming potentials from the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report; (e) Covering the same area: entire national territory; (f) Using the same assumptions for estimating carbon stock changes, including that biomass is oxidized in the year of land conversion, dead organic matter and SOC are oxidized over a 20-year transition period following land conversion and all land is managed; (g) Using the same forest definition: land with an area of at least 0.5 ha, tree height of at least 5 m and canopy cover of at least 30 per cent. The LULUCF experts conclude that Belize ensured overall consistency between its assessed FRL and estimated results and commend the Party for its strong national ownership of the overall process of collecting, processing and reporting the data used to estimate the results.	
2	11(a) Consistency with the guidelines in paragraph 3 of the annex to decision 14/CP.19	The LULUCF experts noted that some data and information used by Belize to estimate the results of implementing the activities reducing emissions from deforestation, reducing emissions from forest degradation, conservation of forest	

Finding ID#	*Aspect of the scope of the TA (decision 14/CP.19, para. 11)*	*Description of the issue, additional information shared by the Party during the TA and conclusions of the LULUCF experts*	*Area for future technical improvement*
	(consistency with the assessed FREL/FRL)	carbon stocks, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks were not consistent with those used for constructing the assessed FRL. They include: (a) The treatment of REDD+ activities and the allocation of land areas, land-use changes, forest disturbances and associated emissions and removals to those activities; (b) The treatment of the litter carbon pool, which was explicitly included in the FRL but not explicitly identified in the narrative description of carbon pools in the technical annex; (c) The treatment of emissions and removals associated with natural disturbances on managed land; (d) The use of remote sensing data with inconsistent spatial and temporal availability across the time series; (e) The classification or reclassification of forest plots as mature or secondary broadleaf forest following disturbances. During the TA, Belize explained that: (a) It applied a land-based approach covering all forest-related emissions and removals across the national territory, rather than assigning emissions and removals to individual REDD+ activities, and used the same methods and Microsoft Excel calculation tool to prepare the national GHG inventory, FRL and REDD+ results; (b) The litter carbon pool was included in the estimation of the results and is represented in the Excel calculation tool; (c) All land in the country is treated as managed under the managed land proxy and natural and anthropogenic disturbances are not treated separately across the national territory and the time series; (d) Consistency of AD is ensured through the uniform application of a standardized visual imagery interpretation protocol and a multi-sensor approach to land representation; (e) Decision trees are applied for classification of transitions from non-forest, fallow and regenerating land to secondary forest, and secondary broadleaf forest may take 20–50 years to acquire the characteristics of mature broadleaf forest. The LULUCF experts conclude that Belize ensured overall consistency between its assessed FRL and estimated results.	
3	11(b) Approaches – transparency	The LULUCF experts noted that the technical annex does not clearly explain the treatment of the REDD+ activities included in the assessed FRL and the reported	The LULUCF experts reiterate, in relation to the technical annex, the finding identified

Finding ID#	*Aspect of the scope of the TA (decision 14/CP.19, para. 11)*	*Description of the issue, additional information shared by the Party during the TA and conclusions of the LULUCF experts*	*Area for future technical improvement*
		results, including how emissions and removals associated with the five REDD+ activities are reflected in the consolidated estimates. The LULUCF experts also noted that the information provided does not clearly explain how the national GHG inventory, the assessed FRL and the reported results are linked, including whether data on emissions and removals can be disaggregated by REDD+ activity. During the TA, Belize explained that it uses a land-based approach covering all forest-related emissions and removals across the national territory. It also explained that, because its FRL and results are national in scope and include all forest-related sources and sinks, emissions and removals are not assigned to individual REDD+ activities. It indicated that it used the same methods and the same Excel calculation tool to prepare the national GHG inventory, the FRL and the REDD+ results and that all land in the country is treated as managed land. The LULUCF experts acknowledged that the additional information provided by Belize helped to explain the methodological approach used to estimate the results. However, they noted that further explanation of the relationship between the national land-based approach, the REDD+ activities, the national GHG inventory, the assessed FRL and the reported results, including the provision, where feasible, of disaggregated data on emissions and removals by REDD+ activity, would facilitate a better understanding of how the five REDD+ activities are reflected in the consolidated estimates. In the modified technical annex, Belize clarified that its national land-based approach includes all five activities referred to in paragraph 70 of decision 1/CP.16 and covers all forest-related sources and sinks across the national territory. Belize noted that the relevant decisions of the Conference of the Parties do not require emissions and removals to be estimated, allocated or reported separately by REDD+ activity, nor do they prescribe definitions of those activities. Belize explained that the FRL, the national GHG inventory and the reported results are structured according to IPCC land-use categories and that emissions and removals are therefore not allocated separately to individual REDD+ activities. The LULUCF experts acknowledge the clarification provided by Belize in the modified technical annex on its national land-based approach, explaining that it includes all five REDD+ activities. However, the experts noted that further explanation of how the five REDD+ activities are reflected in the national land-based accounting framework, together with the provision, where feasible, of disaggregated data on emissions and removals by REDD+ activity, would facilitate a better understanding of the relationship between the REDD+ activities, the national GHG inventory, the FRL and the reported results.	in the report on the technical assessment of Belize's FRL that providing, where feasible, disaggregated data on emissions and removals by REDD+ activity, in addition to consolidated estimates calculated using the national land-based approach, and clarifying the links between the GHG inventory, REDD+ activities, the FRL and the reported results is an area for future technical improvement.

Finding ID#	*Aspect of the scope of the TA (decision 14/CP.19, para. 11)*	*Description of the issue, additional information shared by the Party during the TA and conclusions of the LULUCF experts*	*Area for future technical improvement*
4	11(b) EFs – transparency	The LULUCF experts noted that the technical annex does not provide sufficiently clear and detailed technical information that supports the national EFs and removal factors used to estimate the results, including the underlying reports, methodological descriptions, data sources and calculation steps. The LULUCF experts also noted that forest plantations are included in the second subcategory of a forest land category (level 2 forest class), but that the documentation of the relevant data sources, parameters and treatment of EFs and removal factors applied for forest plantations is not sufficiently clear. During the TA, Belize explained that information on the methodological framework, data sources and procedures used to derive EFs is contained in section 4.8 of the modified FRL submission. Belize indicated that the EFs are contained in the Excel calculation tool and that the underlying data used to calculate the EFs are available in the supporting documentation. Belize clarified that forest plantations are included as a level 2 forest class in the modified FRL submission and that the corresponding EFs and removal factors are included in the Excel calculation tool. The LULUCF experts acknowledged that the additional information provided by Belize improved the traceability of the EFs and removal factors used for estimating the results. However, they noted that the information provided consists mainly of text from the modified FRL submission, raw data spreadsheets and the Excel calculation tool, and that they could not find technical documentation for each forest subcategory explaining the derivation of the relevant EFs and removal factors, the treatment of the underlying data used to calculate them and the calculation steps. In annex II to the modified technical annex, Belize provided a summary of the EFs and removal factors applied by forest category and carbon pool. The annex presents the values of the EFs and removal factors and their associated uncertainties, the underlying data sources and methods used to derive these factors, and references to the relevant supporting data and methodological information in the modified FRL submission, modified technical annex and foundational platform. The foundational platform serves as a national calculation tool that combines AD and EFs to estimate GHG emissions and removals. The annex also provides information on the treatment of forest plantations, including the use of expert judgment to estimate above-ground biomass in the absence of dedicated field measurements and the application of IPCC default values for carbon fraction, root-to-shoot ratio and annual biomass growth. The LULUCF experts commend Belize for providing this additional information in the modified technical annex, which enhances the transparency and traceability of the EFs and removal factors used to estimate the reported results. The information provided in annex II to the modified technical annex clarifies the	

Finding ID#	*Aspect of the scope of the TA (decision 14/CP.19, para. 11)*	*Description of the issue, additional information shared by the Party during the TA and conclusions of the LULUCF experts*	*Area for future technical improvement*
		underlying data sources and methods used to derive these factors, and facilitates the identification of relevant parameters, including those applied to forest plantations. The LULUCF experts acknowledge that the additional information addresses the transparency-related issue identified during the TA, while noting that integrating the information provided by the Party in annex II to the modified technical annex into the main methodological sections of the modified technical annex would further enhance transparency.	
5	11(b) EFs – accuracy	The LULUCF experts noted that the country-specific above-ground biomass value for secondary broadleaf forest, estimated at 239.53 t dry matter per ha on the basis of three plots, is higher than the IPCC default value, and sought clarification from Belize on the rationale for considering these plots representative of secondary broadleaf forest in the country. During the TA, Belize explained that the estimate was derived from three plots: BZ-55 Honey Camp National Park, BZ-59 Golden Stream National Park and BZ-60 Vaca Forest Reserve. Belize indicated that BZ-55 was classified as lowland secondary dry broadleaf forest, while BZ-59 and BZ-60 were considered secondary broadleaf forests, and that no disturbances had been recorded on the three plots. Belize explained that the above-ground biomass estimate has a 32.78 per cent confidence interval and is broadly comparable to the relevant default values in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines and the 2019 Refinement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.	The LULUCF experts note that further strengthening and documenting the representativeness of country-specific biomass estimates for secondary broadleaf forest, including through use of additional field data, as appropriate, is an area for future technical improvement that would increase the accuracy of the technical annex.
6	11(b) AD – transparency	The LULUCF experts noted that the methodology used for estimating AD through a sampling approach appears to be generally consistent across the time series. However, they noted that the imagery interpretation process involved various sources of remote sensing data across the time series. During the TA, Belize explained that methodological consistency is ensured through the uniform application of a standardized visual imagery interpretation protocol, rather than relying on a single data source for estimating AD. The Party also explained that a multi-sensor approach is systematically applied in the sampling approach to avoid sensor-specific bias and ensure methodological consistency across the time series. Belize provided additional information, in particular on the different data sources involved in the multi-sensor approach. The LULUCF experts commend Belize for its efforts to enhance the transparency and completeness of the data and information provided, thereby allowing for reconstruction of the results. However, the LULUCF experts noted that the technical annex would benefit from clearer documentation of the different data sources used for estimating AD across the time series, including their temporal and spatial availability, the role of each source in the interpretation process and the decision rules applied in relation to the	

Finding ID#	*Aspect of the scope of the TA (decision 14/CP.19, para. 11)*	*Description of the issue, additional information shared by the Party during the TA and conclusions of the LULUCF experts*	*Area for future technical improvement*
		classification of forest when comparable imagery is not available for all years in the time series. The LULUCF experts also noted that the forest-level classification process could benefit from further strengthening in terms of objectivity and efficiency, including, where appropriate, through further methodological standardization or semi-automated approaches. In the modified technical annex, Belize referred to its revised land-use assessment protocol, which provides information on the data sources used across the time series, their temporal availability and their respective application in the interpretation process. The revised protocol also establishes primary and secondary data sources, as well as data-validation sources, decision rules for selecting sources and filling gaps, procedures for documenting discrepancies, and quality assurance and quality control arrangements for the visual interpretation of sample plots and validation of the resulting AD on land use and land-use change. The LULUCF experts commend Belize for providing this additional information in the modified technical annex. The information provided on the revised land-use assessment protocol enhances the transparency of the multi-sensor approach used to estimate AD and clarifies how imagery sources are selected and applied consistently across the time series. The LULUCF experts consider that this additional documentation addresses the transparency-related issue identified during the TA.	
7	11(b) AD – transparency and accuracy	The LULUCF experts noted that secondary forests are defined as forests regenerating after significant natural or anthropogenic disturbance, but that the technical annex and supporting documentation do not clearly describe the methodological procedures used to classify or reclassify forest plots as mature or secondary forest following disturbance. Specifically, the land-transition matrix does not appear to show explicit transitions between mature and secondary forests of the same forest type, and it is not clear under which conditions recovering secondary forests are reclassified as mature forests. During the TA, Belize explained that its land-use assessment protocol includes guidance on transitions to mature broadleaf forest. In land-use categories with forest plots with little to no regeneration, such as bare soil, pasture and cropland, they generally require approximately 18 years without disturbance and with natural regeneration to be classified as secondary broadleaf forest, provided they meet the national forest definition. In land-use categories with forest plots with some regeneration, such as fallow land and regenerating bushes and shrubs, they generally require approximately 10 years without disturbance to be classified as secondary broadleaf forest, also subject to meeting the forest definition. Belize clarified that the 20- to 50-year transition period from secondary to mature broadleaf forest is applied as indicative guidance rather than as a fixed national	

Finding ID#	*Aspect of the scope of the TA (decision 14/CP.19, para. 11)*	*Description of the issue, additional information shared by the Party during the TA and conclusions of the LULUCF experts*	*Area for future technical improvement*
		threshold. It explained that reclassification is determined through visual interpretation and time-series analysis of forest structural characteristics, evidence of disturbance and surrounding landscape conditions. It also explained that a plot is reclassified as mature broadleaf forest in the first year of the time series in which it is interpreted, on the basis of sequential imagery interpretation and expert judgment, as exhibiting mature forest characteristics. The LULUCF experts acknowledged the clarification provided by Belize, but noted that the technical annex and supporting documentation would benefit from a clearer description of how the qualitative criteria used to distinguish between secondary and mature broadleaf forest are operationalized in the annual time series and implemented in the calculation tool. This includes clarification of how visual indicators, disturbance history, surrounding landscape conditions and expert judgment are documented and applied consistently across plots and years, and how the corresponding EF assignment is triggered. In the modified technical annex, Belize referred to its revised land-use assessment protocol, which provides the decision rules applied to distinguish between secondary and mature broadleaf forest. The protocol describes the criteria for classifying and reclassifying secondary and mature broadleaf forest, multi-temporal evidence and spectral trajectories used to support the visual interpretation and classification of these forest types, the rules for assigning the year of transition and reclassification, and the link between the resulting forest classification and the corresponding EF assignment. The LULUCF experts commend Belize for providing this additional information in the modified technical annex. The revised land-use assessment protocol clarifies how the criteria for classifying and reclassifying secondary and mature broadleaf forest are operationalized and applied in the time series.	
8	11(b) AD – transparency	The LULUCF experts noted that Belize provided information related to accuracy of the reported results, including uncertainties associated with AD, EFs and total emissions and removals across land-use categories. The uncertainty associated with AD was primarily linked to interpretation error arising from the land-use assessment and was quantified for each land-use category. The LULUCF experts noted that sampling uncertainty was not quantified or included in the uncertainty assessment for AD. During the TA, Belize explained that it had made progress in estimating the uncertainty associated with AD since the submission of its original technical annex and that the quantification of random sampling error had recently been finalized. The resulting uncertainty calculations and estimates were shared during the TA and could therefore be included in future submissions of technical annexes.	

Finding ID#	*Aspect of the scope of the TA (decision 14/CP.19, para. 11)*	*Description of the issue, additional information shared by the Party during the TA and conclusions of the LULUCF experts*	*Area for future technical improvement*
		The LULUCF experts noted that including the quantification of random sampling error in future submissions would enhance the accuracy and completeness of the uncertainty assessment, given that the AD are derived from a systematic sampling framework. In the modified technical annex, Belize provided information on the quantification of the sampling uncertainty associated with the AD. Belize explained that the uncertainty associated with the area estimates for each land-use category was quantified using the random error approach described in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (vol. 4, chap. 3) and incorporated into the propagation of uncertainty for total annual emissions and removals. The modified technical annex reports uncertainties associated with the total net balance of 49.03 per cent for 2021 and 43.82 per cent for 2022. The LULUCF experts commend Belize for providing this additional information in the modified technical annex. The inclusion of information on the sampling uncertainty associated with the AD enhances the completeness of the uncertainty assessment and demonstrates that this source of uncertainty was taken into account in estimating the uncertainty of the reported results.	
9	11(c) Consistency with the guidelines in paragraphs 1–2 of the annex to decision 14/CP.19 (summary information and results)	Belize provided information on the assessed FRL, the activities implemented, the territorial forest area, the date of the FRL submission, the date of the final technical assessment report, the period of the FRL and the results in t CO_2 eq/year. The technical annex identifies the activities included as reducing emissions from deforestation, reducing emissions from forest degradation, conservation of forest carbon stocks, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks. It indicates that the FRL is national in scope, applies to 2021–2025 and is expressed as –2,218,935 t CO_2 eq/year. Belize reported results of 5,001,627 t CO_2 eq for 2021 and 2,926,429 t CO_2 eq for 2022, measured against the assessed FRL. The LULUCF experts conclude that Belize provided the summary information and results as required.	
10	11(c) Consistency with the guidelines in paragraph 4 of the annex to decision 14/CP.19 (NFMS)	The LULUCF experts noted that Belize provided a description of its NFMS and a summary of the roles and responsibilities of the agencies and institutions involved in MRV of the results in the technical annex. The NFMS covers the entire country, equalling 22,110 km^2. The system assesses land use, land-use change, forest disturbances, forest-area changes, forest-related emissions and removals and forest carbon stocks using a combination of remote sensing and ground-based forest carbon inventory approaches. The NFMS applies the same national land-based approach used for the assessed FRL and the reported	

Finding ID#	*Aspect of the scope of the TA (decision 14/CP.19, para. 11)*	*Description of the issue, additional information shared by the Party during the TA and conclusions of the LULUCF experts*	*Area for future technical improvement*
		results, covering all forest-related emissions and removals, all carbon pools, all sources and sinks, and all forest-area changes. During the TA, Belize explained that all relevant REDD+ activities are covered within this approach. According to paragraph 4(b) of decision 11/CP.19, the NFMS should enable the assessment of different types of forest in the country, including natural forest. The LULUCF experts noted that Belize's NFMS distinguishes between forest types and subclasses, including mature broadleaf forest, secondary broadleaf forest, pine forest, mangroves and forest plantations, and uses national land-use assessment data and forest inventory information to estimate forest-related emissions and removals. The LULUCF experts conclude that Belize provided the information required on its NFMS and institutional roles and responsibilities in MRV of the results. The LULUCF experts commend Belize for having developed the national capacity required to operate and maintain the NFMS and for its nationally led approach to forest monitoring.	
11	11(c) Consistency with the guidelines in paragraph 5 of the annex to decision 14/CP.19 (reconstruction of the results)	The LULUCF experts noted that Belize provided the modified FRL submission, supporting information and the Excel calculation tool to estimate the reported results. The Excel calculation tool contains multiple worksheets, linked calculations and parameter tables, and the LULUCF experts initially encountered difficulties in tracing the calculation process from the input AD, EFs, removal factors, assumptions and IPCC equations through to the final annual results reported in the technical annex. During the TA, Belize provided further explanations of the structure and operation of the Excel calculation tool, including relevant calculations and supporting information on EFs and removal factors. These explanations, together with the information made available during the TA, enabled the LULUCF experts to understand and reconstruct the reported results. The LULUCF experts acknowledged the explanations provided by Belize during the TA and confirmed that the information made available was sufficient to reconstruct the reported results. However, they noted that additional documentation of the calculation pathways. worksheet linkages, parameter sources and data flows, together with clearer guidance on the structure and use of the Excel calculation tool, would facilitate the reconstruction of the results and improve the accessibility and usability of the supporting information.	The LULUCF experts note that further improving the documentation and guidance on the structure and use of the Excel calculation tool, including calculation pathways, worksheet linkages, parameter sources and data flow, is an area of future technical improvement that would facilitate the reconstruction of the results reported in the technical annex.
12	11(c) Consistency with the guidelines in paragraph 6 of the annex to decision 14/CP.19	Belize provided a description of how IPCC guidance and guidelines were taken into account in accordance with paragraph 1(c) of decision 4/CP.15. For estimating emission reductions and removals, Belize used the methodology	

Finding ID#	*Aspect of the scope of the TA (decision 14/CP.19, para. 11)*	*Description of the issue, additional information shared by the Party during the TA and conclusions of the LULUCF experts*	*Area for future technical improvement*
	(how the elements contained in para. 1(c–d) of decision 4/CP.15 have been taken into account)	provided in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, the 2019 Refinement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines and the *2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands*. Accordingly, emissions and removals from the activities reducing emissions from deforestation, reducing emissions from forest degradation, conservation of forest carbon stocks, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks were estimated for 2021–2022 by combining AD (i.e. areas of annual deforestation) with the appropriate EF (i.e. emissions associated with the corresponding forest type). The LULUCF experts noted that Belize used a historical average approach to establish its FRL in its modified FRL submission. For its latest GHG inventory, Belize applied the managed land proxy in accordance with the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, whereby all land within the national territory is considered managed. Belize's approach is consistent with decisions 4/CP.15 and 12/CP.17. Accordingly, the REDD+ results are assessed against the benchmark of this historical average. The LULUCF experts acknowledge the application of the historical average approach to ensure consistency with the relevant IPCC guidelines. The LULUCF experts note that the REDD+ results presented in the technical annex represent emission reductions and removals relative to the assessed FRL and are consistent with the national GHG inventory submitted alongside Belize's BTR1.	
13	11(d) Accuracy of the results proposed in the technical annex	Both the established FRL and the results obtained for 2021–2022 from implementing the activities reducing emissions from deforestation, reducing emissions from forest degradation, conservation of forest carbon stocks, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks are based on the assumption that disturbances recorded in the Excel calculation tool are correctly interpreted and translated into annual emissions and removals without double counting of affected areas or biomass losses. The LULUCF experts noted that the Excel calculation tool includes repeated disturbance entries for the same plot and disturbance type, including repeated shifting cultivation entries across the time series and cases where more than one fire disturbance appears to be recorded for the same plot and year. The LULUCF experts also noted that, in some cases, repeated percentage values for the land area affected by the same disturbance type may cumulatively exceed 100 per cent. The technical annex and supporting documentation do not clearly explain how such repeated entries are interpreted and translated into emissions and removals, including whether they represent independent disturbance events, cumulative affected area, annual affected area, repeated observations of the same affected area, biomass component affected or separate disturbance episodes within the same year.	The LULUCF experts note that improving the methodological treatment of repeated disturbance events, including by ensuring consistent implementation of the forest-definition threshold in the case of cumulative disturbances that do not allow for regeneration, and by clarifying the treatment of multiple fire records for the same plot and year, is an area for future technical improvement that would increase the accuracy of the results reported in the technical annex.

Finding ID#	*Aspect of the scope of the TA (decision 14/CP.19, para. 11)*	*Description of the issue, additional information shared by the Party during the TA and conclusions of the LULUCF experts*	*Area for future technical improvement*
		During the TA, Belize explained that disturbances are grouped according to their effect on forest regeneration and the extent of biomass affected. Belize clarified that, for group 1 disturbances (no expected regeneration following disturbances such as shifting cultivation, grazing, mining and infrastructure) and group 2 disturbances (expected regeneration following disturbances such as hurricanes and logging), the recorded percentage values represent the cumulative area affected, whereas for fire and pest disturbances the recorded percentage values represent biomass affected rather than area affected. Belize also explained that the recorded percentage values are not directly applied as plot-specific biomass loss percentages in the calculation tool. Instead, for forest land remaining forest land, emissions are estimated using predefined loss factors for first and subsequent disturbance events. Belize further explained that repeated disturbance factors may continue to be applied only until the forest-definition threshold is reached. Once this threshold is exceeded, the plot is expected to transition from forest land remaining forest land to forest land converted to another land-use category. The LULUCF experts observed that the clarification provided by Belize helped to explain the intended distinction between area-based disturbance values for group 1 and group 2 disturbances and biomass-based disturbance values for fire and pest disturbances. However, the LULUCF experts found that the clarification did not fully resolve the issue regarding how these disturbance values are interpreted and consistently implemented in the Excel calculation tool, particularly in relation to land-use classification and transition between forest classifications. For shifting cultivation, the LULUCF experts understood that the recorded percentage values represent cumulative area affected, and that shifting cultivation was treated as a disturbance type that did not allow regeneration. The LULUCF experts noted that repeated shifting cultivation entries that cumulatively exceed the forest-cover threshold would be considered as a land-use conversion. However, the information provided did not clearly demonstrate that such land-use conversion is consistently applied in the Excel calculation tool for all plots with repeated shifting cultivation entries. For fire, the LULUCF experts understood that the recorded percentage values represent biomass affected rather than area affected. However, this clarification did not fully explain cases where more than one fire disturbance appears to be recorded for the same plot and year. In particular, it remained unclear whether these entries represent multiple independent fire events, different biomass components affected by the same event, repeated observations of the same affected biomass or an operator or tool error. The LULUCF experts were therefore not able to determine whether the treatment of multiple fire entries for the same	

Finding ID#	*Aspect of the scope of the TA (decision 14/CP.19, para. 11)*	*Description of the issue, additional information shared by the Party during the TA and conclusions of the LULUCF experts*	*Area for future technical improvement*
		plot and year fully avoids double counting of affected biomass or associated emissions. The LULUCF experts concluded that the treatment of repeated disturbance entries, in particular for shifting cultivation and fires, may affect the accuracy of the results reported in the technical annex. In the modified technical annex, Belize referred to its revised land-use assessment protocol, which documents the treatment of repeated disturbance events. Belize explained that individual disturbance events are recorded separately to preserve the complete disturbance history of each plot, that the affected area is quantified for each event and that cumulative effects are assessed against the forest-definition thresholds as part of the land-use interpretation process, including where multiple disturbance events are recorded for the same plot and year. The LULUCF experts acknowledge the additional documentation provided by Belize in the modified technical annex, which further clarifies the treatment of repeated disturbance events during land-use interpretation. However, the experts note that further clarification is needed to demonstrate how the interpretation of cumulative disturbance effects and forest-definition thresholds is consistently reflected in the Excel calculation tool, including for plots with repeated shifting cultivation entries. Further clarification is also needed on the treatment of multiple fire entries for the same plot and year to demonstrate how double counting of affected biomass and associated emissions is avoided. The LULUCF experts therefore consider that the treatment of repeated disturbance entries remains an issue that may affect the accuracy of the reported results.	
14	11(d) Accuracy of the results proposed in the technical annex	The LULUCF experts observed that the Excel calculation tool does not appear to include a mechanism for triggering a transition in forest classification following repeated fire disturbances and associated biomass losses, for example from mature to secondary forest (see finding ID# 7). The LULUCF experts highlighted that, where repeated fires result in substantial biomass loss, continued classification of the plot as mature forest may not accurately represent post-disturbance forest conditions, biomass stock, subsequent removals or future disturbance emissions. The LULUCF experts concluded that the absence of a clear mechanism for linking repeated disturbances to changes in forest conditions may affect the accuracy of the estimates of biomass stock and results reported in the technical annex. In the modified technical annex, Belize clarified that the classification of forest plots and the assignment of the relevant IPCC equations are undertaken manually in accordance with its national methodological guidelines. Belize explained that its estimation approach takes into account post-disturbance forest carbon stocks,	The LULUCF experts note that improving the representation of transitions in post-disturbance forest conditions in the Excel calculation tool, in particular transitions between mature and secondary forest following repeated disturbances, is an area for future technical improvement that would increase the accuracy of the results reported in the technical annex.

Finding ID#	*Aspect of the scope of the TA (decision 14/CP.19, para. 11)*	*Description of the issue, additional information shared by the Party during the TA and conclusions of the LULUCF experts*	*Area for future technical improvement*
		subsequent removals and possible future disturbances. Belize noted that the biomass loss factors applied to different disturbance types are currently defined through expert judgment and that plots with more than two recorded fire events over the time series represent less than 0.4 per cent of mature broadleaf forest plots. The LULUCF experts acknowledge the clarification provided by Belize in the modified technical annex and the information indicating that only a limited number of mature broadleaf forest plots have more than two recorded fire events. However, they note that it remains unclear how changes in post-disturbance forest conditions are reflected in the assignment of the appropriate forest classification. The experts also note that further clarification would be useful on how the disturbance factors defined by disturbance type account for plot-specific changes in carbon stocks following repeated fires.	
15	11(d) Accuracy of the results proposed in the technical annex	Belize provided some information related to the uncertainty associated with annual biomass gains and removals from forest land remaining forest land. The LULUCF experts observed that in the Excel calculation tool the uncertainty level associated with annual biomass gains and removals appears to be estimated by treating the above-ground and below-ground biomass increment components as independent. The LULUCF experts highlighted that the below-ground biomass increment appears to be derived from the above-ground biomass growth estimate using a root-to-shoot ratio, rather than being estimated independently. Therefore, the above-ground and below-ground biomass increment components do not appear to be fully independent as they are based on common underlying information. During the TA, Belize explained that the above-ground and below-ground biomass growth components were not treated as independent when estimating the relative uncertainty of the total annual biomass carbon increment/removal factor for forest land remaining forest land, and that the uncertainty was estimated by iteratively applying equations 3.1 and 3.2 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (vol. 1, chap. 3). Belize provided the formula used in the calculation tool. However, the Party did not provide recalculated uncertainties or explain whether the uncertainty values associated with the above-ground and below-ground biomass increments and the uncertainty associated with the reported biomass removals would change if dependencies between shared parameters were explicitly accounted for. In the modified technical annex, Belize provided additional information on the methodology for calculating uncertainty, including the uncertainty of AD, EFs and removal factors, and the application of approach 1 error propagation in accordance with the 2006 IPCC Guidelines to estimate the total uncertainty associated with annual emissions and removals across the relevant land-use categories. Belize	The LULUCF experts note that recalculating the uncertainty associated with annual biomass gains and removals by accounting for dependencies arising from shared parameters when combining the uncertainties of above-ground and below-ground biomass increment components, and propagating the corrected uncertainty estimates through all affected categories and years, is an area for future technical improvement that would increase the accuracy of the uncertainty estimates associated with the results reported in the technical annex.

Finding ID#	*Aspect of the scope of the TA (decision 14/CP.19, para. 11)*	*Description of the issue, additional information shared by the Party during the TA and conclusions of the LULUCF experts*	*Area for future technical improvement*
		reiterated that the above-ground and below-ground biomass growth components were not treated as independent when estimating the relative uncertainty of the total annual biomass carbon increment/removal factor for forest land remaining forest land. Belize explained that below-ground biomass growth was derived from above-ground biomass growth using a root-to-shoot ratio and that the associated uncertainty was estimated by iteratively applying equations 3.1 and 3.2 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (vol. 1, chap. 3). The LULUCF experts welcomed the additional information provided in the modified technical annex, which enhances the transparency of the uncertainty assessment. Following the clarification provided by Belize, the experts further examined the uncertainty calculations used in the Excel calculation tool. They confirmed that the calculation of total annual biomass gains appropriately represents below-ground biomass growth as a function of above-ground biomass growth and the root-to-shoot ratio. However, although this dependency is reflected in the calculation of total annual biomass gains, the uncertainties associated with the above-ground and below-ground biomass increment components are estimated separately and subsequently combined using an approach applicable to uncorrelated quantities. As both components depend on common underlying parameters, including the same above-ground biomass growth estimate and carbon fraction, the associated uncertainties are not independent. The treatment of these components as uncorrelated in the uncertainty propagation does not adequately account for their shared parameters, resulting in an underestimation of the uncertainty associated with total annual biomass gains and removals. The experts also noted that these uncertainty estimates were propagated in the estimates of total uncertainty of the reported results for 2021 and 2022. The LULUCF experts concluded that, although the modified technical annex provides additional information that enhances the transparency of the general uncertainty assessment, the method used to combine the uncertainties of the above-ground and below-ground biomass increment components does not adequately account for dependencies arising from shared parameters. This results in an underestimation of the uncertainty associated with annual biomass gains and removals and may consequently affect the overall uncertainty of the reported REDD+ results, which aggregates uncertainties associated with emissions and removals across the relevant land-use categories and carbon pools.	

III. Conclusions

15. The LULUCF experts conclude that Belize reported the results of implementing five activities, namely reducing emissions from deforestation, reducing emissions from forest degradation, conservation of forest carbon stocks, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks, and followed a land-based approach covering all forest areas and forest-area changes in Belize, applying the same forest definition as that used for constructing the FRL. The results include estimates of CO_2 emissions and removals from above-ground and below-ground biomass, deadwood, litter and SOC, as applicable to the relevant land-use category and transition, and CH_4 and N_2O emissions associated with biomass burning on forest land remaining forest land.

16. The LULUCF experts also conclude that the results presented of implementing the activities reducing emissions from deforestation, reducing emissions from forest degradation, conservation of forest carbon stocks, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks are consistent with the assessed FRL. The LULUCF experts commend Belize for ensuring consistency of data and methodologies between the FRL submission for 2011–2020 and the technical annex with the results for 2021–2022.

17. The data and information provided in the technical annex are considered to be mostly transparent (see finding ID# 3 in the table above), consistent, complete and mostly accurate (see finding ID# 5 in the table above). The LULUCF experts further conclude that Belize provided the information necessary for reconstructing the results of implementing the activities reducing emissions from deforestation, reducing emissions from forest degradation, conservation of forest carbon stocks, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks.

18. The LULUCF experts acknowledge that the technical annex includes summary information from the final report containing the assessed FRL; results in t CO_2 eq/year that are consistent with the assessed FRL; a demonstration that the methodologies used to produce the results are consistent with those used to establish the assessed FRL; a description of the NFMS and institutional roles and responsibilities in MRV of the results; the information necessary for reconstructing the results; and a description of how the elements contained in paragraph 1(c–d) of decision 4/CP.15 have been taken into account. The LULUCF experts conclude that the data and information provided in the technical annex are consistent with the guidelines referred to in paragraph 9 of decision 14/CP.19.

19. The results are mostly accurate based on the assumptions used (see finding ID#s 5 and 13–15 in the table above).

20. Pursuant to paragraph 14 of decision 14/CP.19, the LULUCF experts identified areas for future technical improvement (see the table above). The LULUCF experts conclude that the following areas for future technical improvement identified in the report on the technical assessment of Belize's FRL also apply to the provision of information on the results:

(a) Including a detailed description of the assumptions and specific methods used to calculate the annual biomass growth rate for estimating removals from primary and mature broadleaf forest;

(b) Including a comprehensive description of the assumptions and specific methods used to estimate stocks of above-ground biomass and emissions from undisturbed mature broadleaf forest;

(c) Including a rationale, scientific documentation or other relevant technical information to support the application of expert judgment that equates the proportion of below-ground biomass lost due to fires with the loss of above-ground biomass due to fires, or using field data and scientific studies to calculate the fraction of biomass lost due to fires;

(d) Elaborating and refining the methodology used for estimating uncertainties of EFs and AD, including the propagation of uncertainty in emission estimates.

21. During the consultation process, Belize identified a number of capacity-building needs. Addressing those needs could enable Belize to improve its data and methodologies for future FRL submissions. After exchanges with the LULUCF experts, Belize identified the following continued capacity-building needs for further strengthening the reporting process for the technical annex:

(a) Enhancing technical capacity in applying advanced GHG inventory methodologies, land-use and land-use change modelling, remote sensing and geographic information system applications, and uncertainty assessment in accordance with IPCC guidance;

(b) Improving national data-collection systems by strengthening institutional coordination among relevant agencies, and expanding access to updated software, satellite imagery and analytical tools;

(c) Improving quality assurance and quality control procedures for the collection, interpretation and validation of AD on land use and land-use change, and ensuring time-series consistency;

(d) Developing country-specific EFs;

(e) Sustaining financial and technical support for maintaining and strengthening national expertise in MRV for REDD+ activities over the long term.

22. In conclusion, the LULUCF experts commend Belize for showing strong commitment to continuously improving the data and information used for calculating the results, in line with the stepwise approach, which are consistent with those used for constructing its assessed FRL. Some areas for future technical improvement and capacity-building needs identified by Belize have been identified in this report. At the same time, the LULUCF experts acknowledge that such improvements are subject to national capabilities and circumstances, and note the importance of adequate and predictable support.[8] The LULUCF experts also acknowledge that the TA process was an opportunity for a facilitative and constructive technical exchange of views and information with Belize.[9]

[8] As per decision 2/CP.17, para. 57.
[9] As per decision 14/CP.19, paras. 12–13.

Annex I

Technical annex to the first biennial transparency report

Owing to the complexity and length of the submitted technical annex to the BTR1, and in order to maintain the original formatting, the technical annex has not been reproduced here; it is available at https://unfccc.int/first-biennial-transparency-reports.

Annex II

Summary of main features of reported results of implementing activities referred to in paragraph 70 of decision 1/CP.16 based on information provided by Belize

	Key element	*Remark(s)*
Results reported	5 001 627 t CO_2 eq for 2021 and 2 926 429 t CO_2 eq for 2022	See paragraph 10 of this document
Results period	2021–2022	See paragraph 10 of this document
Assessed FRL	–2 218 935 t CO_2 eq/year	See document FCCC/TAR/2024/BLZ and the modified version of the Party's latest FRL submission of January 2026; see also paragraph 9 of this document
Reference period	2011–2020	See paragraph 10 of this document
National/subnational	National	See paragraph 9 of this document
Activities included	Reducing emissions from deforestation Reducing emissions from forest degradation Conservation of forest carbon stocks Sustainable management of forests Enhancement of forest carbon stocks	See paragraph 10 of this document
Pools included	Above-ground biomass Below-ground biomass Deadwood Litter SOC	
Gases included	CO_2, CH_4, N_2O	
Consistency with assessed FRL	Methods, definitions and information used for constructing the assessed FRL are consistent with those used for estimating the results	
Description of NFMS and institutional roles	Included	See finding ID# 10 in the table in this document
Identification of future technical improvements	Included	Several areas for future technical improvement have been identified (see finding ID#s 3, 5, 11 and 13–15 in the table in and para. 20 of this document)

Annex III

Reference documents

I. Reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

IPCC. 2006. *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*. S Eggleston, L Buendia, K Miwa, et al. (eds.). Hayama, Japan: Institute for Global Environmental Strategies. Available at http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl.

IPCC. 2014. *2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands.* T Hiraishi, T Krug, K Tanabe, et al. (eds.). Geneva: IPCC. Available at https://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/wetlands/.

IPCC. 2019. *2019 Refinement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories.* E Calvo Buendia, K Tanabe, A Kranjc, et al. (eds.). Geneva: IPCC. Available at https://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2019rf/index.html.

II. UNFCCC documents

First and second modified FRL submissions of Belize. Available at https://redd.unfccc.int/submissions/by-country/country_detail/blz.html.

“Guidelines and procedures for the technical assessment of submissions from Parties on proposed forest reference emission levels and/or forest reference levels”. Annex to decision 13/CP.19. Available at https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/docs/2013/cop19/eng/10a01.pdf#page=36.

“Guidelines for elements to be included in the technical annex referred to in decision 14/CP.19, paragraph 7”. Annex to decision 14/CP.19. Available at https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/docs/2013/cop19/eng/10a01.pdf#page=42.

“Guidelines for submissions of information on reference levels”. Annex to decision 12/CP.17. Available at https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/docs/2011/cop17/eng/09a02.pdf#page=19.

Report on the TA of the technical annex to the first biennial update report of Belize submitted in 2021. FCCC/SBI/ICA/2021/TATR.1/BLZ. Available at https://unfccc.int/documents/611812.

Report on the technical assessment of the proposed FRL of Belize submitted in 2024. FCCC/TAR/2024/BLZ. Available at https://unfccc.int/documents/656465.

Report on the technical expert review of the BTR1 of Belize submitted in 2026. FCCC/ETF/TERR.1/2024/BLZ and Add.1. Available at https://unfccc.int/documents/660015 and https://unfccc.int/documents/660016.