

ISFL Pause and Reflect

Summary of Event and Learnings

Introduction

The aim of ISFL is to help rural communities protect their forests, develop sustainably while simultaneously reducing land-based greenhouse gas emissions. ISFL has been supporting five host countries in providing technical assistance to design and prepare for jurisdictional scope AFOLU based emissions-reduction programs. The goal of these programs has been to encourage reduced emissions from better land use practices based on the incentive of both improved incomes and enabling results-based payments.

On June 28-29, 2024, and following the Global REDD+ Knowledge Day, the BioCarbon Fund Initiative for Sustainable Forest Landscapes (ISFL) hosted a “Pause and Reflect” workshop in Oslo, Norway. This marked the first time that government teams, task teams, and ISFL staff—who have been working on the ISFL mission for years—gathered to share their experiences.

The Pause & Reflect event was inspired by the findings of the [ISFL Mid Term Evaluation](#) which in addition to identifying many positive findings of the ISFL program to date and noting some critical areas of challenge, highlighted the opportunity for greater sharing of information between jurisdictions to inform and bolster future programs. The Pause & Reflect event, by convening highly relevant stakeholders who had been critical to the work to date of the ISFL program globally, aimed to drill down into critical areas of the programs to identify opportunities for correction and improvement going forward. To maximize the level of open feedback received from participants and secure a spectrum of inputs from as many of the attendees as possible, the workshop was designed and led by an independent facilitator.

Participants

The workshop convened:

- ISFL **donors** (from Germany, Norway, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the United States),
- World Bank **task team leaders** (from both agricultural and environment practices),
- Client government ISFL **project implementation units** from all five programs (namely Colombia, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Mexico, and Zambia),
- Government representatives from **Ministries of Agriculture and Environment** from all five program countries, and
- Leadership from the **Fund Management Team** of the BioCF ISFL Program.

The session generated a large number of technical insights and feedback, both positive and critical, and provided direction to the BioCF ISFL on how existing programs can be better delivered moving forward, while future programs of this nature can be enhanced and implemented more promptly. This report presents a high-level overview of the feedback received during the workshop, organized around two main themes: a) potential areas for improvement for the five ISFL programs as they move from their grant preparatory programs and into implementation of ER programs; b) learnings to date on preparing for, and establishing, ER programs which can guide other jurisdictional REDD+ AFOLU themed programs going forward. This report is structured to first summarize the general insights from all sessions of the Pause & Reflect, and then provide specific summaries of the four key areas of interest as identified by the [ISFL Mid Term Evaluation](#). A more detailed list of feedback is also contained in Annex 1.

High-Level Insights

The ISFL is a pilot program made up of five similar but different country level pilot programs. Each of these pilots has a different set of contexts while still following the same rigorous and innovative AFOLU methodological approach. There was consensus that this would inevitably lead to both successes and lessons to be learned given the uniqueness of the approach, the ambition of what is being done, and the need to learning by doing since this type of approach has never been done before. Given these conditions, participants believed there was significant value in capturing this learning to inform, and improve, other AFOLU landscape jurisdictional REDD+ programs going forward. While each of these programs are unique, participants raised and emphasized a range of important common factors which in their perspectives underpinned the progress that their programs had made to date and were critical to the success of the programs, including:

1) The need for, and provision of, **high quality technical and legal capacity support**

Attendees highlighted that resources provided by the preparatory grant programs were critical to be able to fill knowledge and capacity gaps. They noted delivering ER programs of this level of complexity and which meet the challenging standards of the ISFL Requirements, especially the use of comprehensive AFOLU carbon accounting, high quality social integrity, and ensure robust ER title, was challenging. These were areas that at the outset most host countries had limited experience. Countries used preparatory grants to both draw on knowledge and expertise of WBG staff (especially MRV and Legal) and to hire technical expert consultants and firms. Participants also highlighted that conducting a needs assessment at the outset, ensuring additional levels of technical support continuing throughout the transition to the ERPA phase, and clarifying and/or simplifying some technical processes or requirements, would also be beneficial.

2) The importance of **flexibility and local ownership** over the process

Attendees noted that while the ISFL Requirements have very rigorous standards for verifying and issuing ERs, they supported ISFL's flexibility in allowing countries to develop their programs and reach these standards. Specifically, they appreciated that the design and implementation of the programs was country-led based on the specific country, and jurisdictional context. For the

countries it was not a “one size fits” all approach to ERPD design, but instead ISFL worked in partnership with countries to provide guidance, which facilitated countries to design programs that meet the ISFL standard but also was done in the context and capacity of the country.

3) The value of a truly **multistakeholder process**

All five countries noted the value of having an inclusive program design approach. Many stakeholders stressed the synergies that partnership between different ministries brought, especially highlighting the value-add of Environment and Agriculture teams working together to design “joined up” interventions. Similarly, the ISFL was complimented for encouraging collaboration between national / federal and provincial levels of government, enabling targeted interventions to be designed and implemented. While attendees shared perspectives about the challenges, there was more emphasis on the outstanding results that came from a focus on ensuring community involvement from the start and throughout the process. In all cases the extra effort, time, and resources required to ensure fully multistakeholder inclusion was seen as extremely worthwhile based on the robustness of the work delivered, and the higher likelihood that this will lead to longer term change with regards to land use. Ensuring adequate capacity building of all stakeholders to fully engage in various aspects of the program, as well as an integrated approach for similar or related tasks or stakeholder groups, was seen as critical.

4) The importance of **transparency** throughout the process

All stakeholders noted the risk inherent in a results-based climate finance program, namely that a lack of performance may result in a lack of results, and disappointment at the community level should anticipated funds not flow. To this end attendees were very pleased about the rigorous transparency of the ISFL program requirements, which they believe ensured that expectations are managed, and that all potential jurisdictional beneficiaries are aware of the timeframe in terms for the fund flows, and the risk that poor results would result in low funds flow. Without such transparency attendees were concerned that communities may become demotivated and dispirited if expectations were unreasonably about potential returns. Nonetheless, continuous proactive multi-stakeholder communications and managing expectations remains important.

5) The value of **knowledge exchange opportunities**, especially South-South with fellow implementers.

Attendees valued their ability to learn from other programs. They requested that the ISFL continued to offer knowledge exchanges that enable innovations to be identified and brought to bear in their countries.

Session 1: ERPD Preparation

The **ERPD preparation** is the process through which each country develops their Emission Reductions Program Document, the key document that lays out their guide for implementing their emission reduction programs. The ERPD preparations were financed in part by the up-front

grant financing (preparatory grant financing). ERPDs include carbon accounting, laying out the ER baseline for the jurisdiction, an action plan, and financial plan for delivering activities and land use change. They include information on the benefit sharing arrangements (for disbursing and distributing ER payments received) and information on the clarification of title to emissions reductions generated. The discussions at the Pause and Reflect on the ERPD preparation focused on how effective and efficient it was, and whether ISFL support was sufficient and appropriately directed.

What has worked to date:

- ✓ Several of the country delegations emphasized the importance and reasonableness of having **rigorous requirements** (including the IPCC Tier 2 compliant methodology) as long as there are adequate support/resources to complete the technical requirements. Most countries flagged that it had been a challenging process but with a valuable steep learning curve. Some said this new capacity could be applied more widely across their activities.
- ✓ Several country delegations also stressed the importance of having **local ownership** over the process. One country flagged how they had intended to assemble a more global team, but COVID had restricted international travel so much that they'd had to revert to more PIU/local staff ownership, which they eventually grew to value immensely, especially for implementation further down the line.
- ✓ Every country was vocal in their support for having a strong **participatory process** with different stakeholders contributing to shaping the process (e.g. flagging policy and regulatory issues to abide by; helping to disseminate information more widely into communities via Chiefdoms; helping to prepare the benefits sharing program etc.). The consultative process was seen to reflect and help integrate what are inherently multisectoral projects – for instance, environment, forestry, inventory, agricultural value chains.
- ✓ Several countries also noted that **ISFL's responsiveness** had been helpful in addressing questions along the way.

What lessons have been learnt:

- ✗ There was a consensus that the process would benefit from some **simplification/streamlining**. Many echoed a similar experience of it being excessively lengthy. A large part of this challenge related to a lack of **data availability**. One country noted that they had to wait for their national forest inventory to be completed, which was going on in parallel to the development of the ERPD.
- ✗ Others noted a need for further and more specific ex-ante **clarity on data requirements and approaches underpinning the carbon accounting for the ISFL Requirements**, especially with regards aligning to the requirements of IPCC Tier 2. Attendees shared

similar experiences of having worked on their MRV baselining for the ERPD only to subsequently learn that the approaches that they had utilized were not acceptable to the independent ERPD validator. This led to significant challenges with regards to reworking data, undergoing significant exchanges during validation process (see next section) and ultimately in needing to amend the ERPD carbon accounting sections to meet the requirements. Attendees noted that had they been aware of these issues upfront they could have saved significant time and effort and finalized the ERPD process much more swiftly. Specific feedback received included the non-acceptability of utilizing countries national methods/approaches; being compelled to move from the REDD+ process where the national forest inventory was currently driven to the IPCC compliant categorization.

- ✘ Attendees also raised the fact that during the ERPD preparation stage the World Bank required the countries to **amend their approach to safeguards** between the grant program and the ER Program, moving from the World Bank safeguard policy (earlier version) to the new World Bank ESF approach. This took time and effort. This change was because during the period of ERPD preparation the World Bank adopted a new safeguards process that required future ER programs to be in compliance with the new ESF approach.
- ✘ All countries flagged the challenge of the **lack of sufficient in-country experience and capacity in AFOLU Carbon Accounting**. They said that at the outset there were insufficient people well-versed in the necessary emission reduction accounting. They also stated that there was a problem in coordinating between people who were doing the GHG accounting alongside the people were working on the policy. There were many requests for more technical support at the country level (which would also help to ensure local ownership) and also more training so that the teams could understand the assessment process in full from the outset.
- ✘ A significant challenge to capacity building in most countries were the **high levels of Institutional changes and staff turnover**. One participant queried how knowledge could flow more readily between national-level institutions with different capacities. In terms of staff turnover, this was noted both at the subnational level within countries but also within World Bank staff. On the former, one participant advised to increase the number of trainees to ensure continuity. On the latter, one mentioned an initial World Bank staffer who used the FREL approach, but then another moved to IPCC subcategory so they had to collect data again.
- ✘ All countries flagged the **need for further integration** of the process. One country mentioned that despite all elements of the ERPD being related, they were contracted separately (e.g. GHG contract, BSP contract, project document and financing plan, etc.), which delayed the work for the other consultants. Groups should be in conversation with each other from the beginning. Also, teams said they sometimes did not see the TOR for aspects of the process.

- ✘ To help with this, participants noted the benefits of conducting a **needs assessment** upfront – to identify the strengths and weaknesses within the country and help ensure capacity is established and remains in the government. This could also help identify potential bottlenecks in the process (e.g. inventory is difficult) and help them feel prepared to gather robust data and to deal with the auditing process.

Section 3: ERPD Assessment and ERPA Negotiation Process

The **ERPD assessment** is the process of having the ERPD assessed and verified as accurate and complete by independent auditors. The **ERPA negotiation** refers to the process in which the BioCF Fund Management Team, on behalf of the donors, negotiates with the host country's negotiation team to agree the ERPA terms and conditions, finalizing them and signing an Emissions Reduction Purchase Agreement (ERPA). These steps are sequential, with ERPA negotiations only commencing once the ERPD is finalized.

What has worked to date:

- ✓ For the ERPA negotiation, the general feedback was that the approach was **innovative** and the terms were **flexible**. One country mentioned the value of being able to sell to third parties for a higher price, should a third-party buyer be identified (this is included in the general conditions of the BioCF ISFL ERPA). Another flagged the value of the fund offering flexibility on the proportion of ER use modalities and note the value of this in terms of being helpful in adapting the ERPA to their particular context (ER Use modalities relates to whether a country selling their ERs receives them back for use against their NDC, or whether the ERs are retained by the relevant buyer).

What lessons have been learnt:

- ✘ As noted in section 2, countries identified that data that they had utilized to complete the ERPD (and the carbon accounting baseline) was ultimately rejected or not accepted by the third party auditor conducting the validation of the ERPD. This was frustrating and clearer direction at the start of the process on what data was acceptable for utilization would have avoided significant time and effort and the need to constantly go back and look for data during the **third-party assessment**. This was especially frustrating when data that the country produced was not acceptable to the assessors.
- ✘ For the ERDP assessment participants wanted the process to have been **clearer upfront**. With regards to the ERPD assessment one attendee noted that they had received contradictory guidance from the auditor and World Bank team during the audit.
- ✘ For the **ERPA negotiations**, some attendees felt there was a lack of full transparency in the process and believing that the format of the term sheet and general conditions should have been shared earlier in the process and not just at the outset of the negotiations (when delivered as part of the ERPA workshop).

- ✘ Some attendees were frustrated by the **lack of flexibility shown by the BioCF relating to the clauses and terms that are in the General Condition** and which the BioCF is reluctant to change. They noted that requests from host country ministers and legal departments for changes to the general conditions were rejected.
- ✘ Attendees requested **more support in preparing for the assessment and the negotiation**. More formal preparation for engaging in the ERPD assessment would have been useful, as would more preparation in advance of negotiation (more than the ERPA workshop delivery). There was a feeling that a **shorter gap between ERPA workshop and negotiations** would have sped things up, as ultimately the people who were trained were not necessarily the people who were involved in the negotiation because of the time gap.
- ✘ There was **mixed feedback in terms of the number of findings produced during the audit** – with one suggesting too few findings while another noting they felt overwhelmed by the number of findings, which made it challenging to be able to provide responses.
- ✘ With regards to ERPA negotiations, views were mixed with one attendee believing that the negotiations were more lengthy than necessary due to both the **PIU and the FMT not being empowered to make decisions** and having to revert to the Ministry and donors respectively. Had the PIU and FMT been able to negotiate terms directly this process may have been much speedier. Another felt unprepared that the **price** being offered was far below what their understanding of what it would be beforehand, leading to concerns about raised expectations amongst their stakeholders.
- ✘ Several countries generally said that the **assessor was not sufficiently equipped** for the job. There were issues with expectations (in terms of data, number of rounds of review, delivery times), language (i.e. having to arrange simultaneous interpretation for all meetings), and lack of understanding of local contexts and legal frameworks etc.
- ✘ Another participant said they had to reconstruct their database because the country consultants used IPCC software, but the auditors wanted to see it in Excel. They stressed the benefit of having simpler software which could help ensure transparency and replicability. Another said there was no guidance coming from FMT or auditors on the ex-ante forecast – with their consultants using the VCS standard for ex-ante estimates yet IPCC for baseline. One participant noted the example of the FAO ExACT tool and NeXT (NDC accounting tool) as a consideration, which they were trained in but told by the auditors it couldn't be used.

Section 4: Benefits Sharing

Benefit sharing is the process through which a wide range of stakeholders are consulted and determine how payments from the sale of ER credits are shared to different stakeholders. The

World Bank ISFL provides a guidance note on how the process should be developed in an inclusive and participatory manner to ensure that indigenous people and others are fully included in the decision making for the BSP.

What has worked to date:

- ✓ The benefits sharing process was broadly seen as **important and useful** to incentivize and reward stakeholders, with **flexibility** required to manage how benefits are determined, through payment allocation and distribution.
- ✓ All of the countries found the **ISFL guidance note on benefits sharing** to be a helpful resource, and they reinforced the balance needed in providing structure and guidance while also remaining flexible enough to allow them to adapt to their specific needs. They noted the need to respond to community feedback and build on other related work.

What lessons have been learnt:

- ✗ There needed to be **more expertise built in country** to know how to maximize benefits – what should be done with contracted ERs, with both modalities, with excess ERs.
- ✗ There was also concern expressed around how to determine and implement aspects of **carbon rights, title transfer, and nested projects**. These were noted as potential topics for follow-up.

Section 5: Private Sector Engagement

Private sector engagement looks at how well private sector has been mobilized to participate in the ER planning and ER program implementation, how well and in what way the private sector has been investing in sustainable practices and engaging in shaping the process and outcomes, and how this has created incentives for long-term sustainability and scalability by continued investment by the private sector at the end of the ISFL engagement.

What has worked to date:

- ✓ Attendees noted that the programs which had a good dynamic with the private sector especially had **overlapping activities** with the forest sector specifically where agriculture was abutting the forests in the jurisdictions.
- ✓ Attendees noted that engaging effectively, and on a large scale, with the private sector in part was determined by the **value chains** available and operating in the jurisdiction. An engaging discussion between countries identified that it's much easier to effect private sector engagement at scale when a jurisdiction has well organized and integrated value chains. They also noted the importance of engaging with industry entities such as federations/associations.

- ✓ Participants highlighted that engaging the private sector at **multiple levels - firm, jurisdictional, and national** - as outlined in the private sector theory of change created opportunities to identify and manage barriers for private sector participation.
- ✓ There was a desire to further advance **South-South Knowledge Exchange** activities among private sector programs, especially in Livestock.

What lessons have been learnt:

- ✘ Some highlighted that there was **limited or mixed success** in incentivizing participation – one mentioning that the financial mechanism for engaging and bringing the private sector into the project was too limited by a cap on private sector sharing of benefits (in the benefit sharing plan). Participants also acknowledged that there is greater need to sensitize stakeholders on the importance of private sector engagement for sustainability.
- ✘ One attendee flagged an issue that engaging with the private sector needed even more **cross-ministry engagement** but in their case collaboration between “very siloed” government ministries made comprehensive private sector engagement very challenging. There was acknowledgement that without direct buy-in by the government and local governments engaging with the private sector would continue to be challenging given the need to directly work on value changes which at times are politically sensitive.
- ✘ It was suggested by an attendee that engagement with the private sector would have been improved had they had a detailed **analysis of the value chains** they were to engage with.

Conclusions and Considerations going forward

The Pause & Reflect event provided an opportunity for BioCF ISFL stakeholders to engage across programs, highlight challenges related to program delivery to date, and collectively identify opportunities for improving existing programs as they move forward and future programs as they are envisioned and initiated.

It is imperative that this exercise does not conclude with the event and this report, but rather acts as a catalyst for improved program implementation in the future. The ISFL will ensure that items and considerations captured are addressed by both the BioCF Fund Management Team and the in-country project teams (both Bank and government) and shared widely so that other integrated land use programs can benefit from this learning. The BioCF ISFL will respond to this feedback by implementing measures for improvement; the most immediate next steps will involve using these insights to further support the ER programs as they transition into operation and ER issuance.

Annex 1: Detailed Considerations

The workshop participants identified a number of considerations that could/should be used by others in the future when designing jurisdictional and REDD+ programs. These suggestions built on from the challenges and successes discussed and detailed above.

Step	Considerations
ERPD preparation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen program implementation focus in the ERPD, with increased clarity on identification of complementary activities that will strengthen the ERP and generate additional ERs; • Provide additional financial support or third party investment so as to mitigate risk of reversals post the end of the grant financing preparatory work; • Overcome the implicit challenges of drafting at two different scales i.e. the national and the local scale implementation, planning and activities. Additional support for countries to think these factors through and then to create local systems with communities to generate implementation effectiveness; • Explore if there is additional support that can be given to countries to build up their A6 / ITMO system alongside their ER program development; •
ERPD assessment and ERPA negotiation process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilize a second ERPA workshop, talking in even more detail about local legal aspects, carbon rights, transfer of title, structure of ERPD – discuss in advance local contexts beforehand; • Adapt and change the TOR for the ERPD assessment firm so as to ensure that there is clarity on the data inputs to be acceptable to meet the ISFL requirements, and also hire multiple firms to provide a range of opinions; • When second phase ERPD assessments are moving to commencement, countries should have additional technical support provided to assist them in undertaking a speedier assessment process to avoid delays; • Set up an ERPA committee in the government with all of the institutions that are part of this project, with an objective of securing a consensus up front on desired ERPA terms and conditions prior to entering negotiations; • Clarify any outstanding queries relating to pricing and ER use modality prior to entering negotiation, so as to facilitate a clear discussion and negotiation; • Provide host countries with expert independent legal support when they are entering negotiations so that they have the greatest ability to negotiate effectively.
Benefit sharing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider whether there are more effective means for utilizing the funds that come from the monetization of results-based climate finance, including the use of payments to fund activities which generate increased ERs from the jurisdiction;

Step	Considerations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider options for supporting countries in maximizing revenue if there is over-delivery of ERs/significant excess ER generation; • Review all conditions of disbursement – especially around fears of noncompliance with regards to the timelines – with acknowledgement that the finalization of the BSP could take up to two years due to the consultations with Indigenous Persons; • Review how and in what form benefits should be distributed if some of the stakeholders in ER programs don't have access to bank accounts; • Put additional effort and focus to identifying how best to include harder-to-reach population groups (including women who often don't have land title); • Provide more guidance on how to incorporate safeguards by bolstering the existing guidance on how safeguards can best be incorporated into the BSP; • Ensure clarity on how to deal with nested projects and allocations between chiefdoms (e.g. heavily vs scarcely populated; heavily vs lightly forested) so as to avoid any appearance of unfairness or unfair preferencing; • Explore options for including sub-agreements for participating in ER programs into the BSP to avoid duplicated processes; • Create local regulations for BSP including: informative workshops with communities, consensus building and validation in the communities on the activities, execution and follow up on how the systems are working in terms of benefit distribution.
<p>Private sector engagement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For marketing of excess ERs or securing higher paying third party buyers, provide technical expertise from legal and marketing experts who understand ERs, how to maximize benefits – what should you do with contracted ERs, with both modalities, with excess ERs • Consider the most effective means for incentivizing and rewarding private sector engagement, especially where this might be either non-monetary in nature (e.g. deforestation certification) or monetary but without a direct payment (e.g. access to bank loans); • Explore the possibility of having a reserve fund (advanced payment held in a fund), with support of the government to facilitate upfront participation of smallholders or other resource-constrained stakeholders in the program; • Need for value chain development – find critical areas where you can help farmers play an active role in the value chains; • Provide direct support to host countries to enable them to more effectively market their ERCs coming out of their ISFL (or future AFOLU) programs, this would support the maximization of monetization; • Ensure farmers are better linked to markets so they see a tangible benefit in participating in sustainability initiatives, beyond a future carbon payment;

Step	Considerations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where value chains are less developed or less integrated, utilize up-front grant financing to assist in market development to improve the integration of value chains so that the economic benefit of participating in sustainable operations is sufficient even before any carbon payment flows (for example: certification support, value chain development).
General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage knowledge in such a way that it can transfer easily even if staff or political or personnel changes occur; Strengthen positive communication on the effects of REDD+ funding to reframe/shift negative coverage.

Annex 2 – Glossary

With a fully technical audience many of the discussions and resultant outputs and findings, were focused on technical matters with their own language, this glossary provides clarity on the major acronyms found in this report.

- **AFOLU** - Agriculture, forestry, and other land use
- **BSP** – Benefit Sharing Plan
- **BUR** - Biennial Update Report
- **ER** – Emission Reduction
- **ERPA** - Emission Reductions Purchase Agreement
- **ERPD** - Emission Reductions Program Document
- **FMT** - Fund Management Team
- **GHG** - Greenhouse gas
- **IPCC** - Intergovernmental Panel for Climate Change
- **ISFL** - Initiative for Sustainable Forest Landscapes
- **ITMO** - Internationally Transferred Mitigation Outcomes
- **MRV** - Monitoring, reporting, and verification
- **NDC** - Nationally determined contributions
- **PIU** - Provincial Implementation Unit
- **RBP** - Results-based payment
- **REDD+** - Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries
- **SCS** - Scientific Certification Systems

Annex 3- Attendee Exit Survey Results

In a post-workshop evaluation, the participants gave the workshop an average ranking of:

- 4.65 (out of 5) in terms of the sessions for the workshop being relevant
- 4.54 (out of 5) in terms of the overall quality of the event
- 4.45 (out of 5) in terms of the workshop having achieved its objectives
- 4.42 (out of 5) in terms of participants feeling they have gained useful knowledge
- 4.40 (out of 5) in terms of participants feeling they have gained new connections

Appendix 4 – Workshop Agenda

Time	Session	Summary	Lead
8:00	Arrival, registration, light breakfast		
8:30	Welcome and introductions	Scene setting, presentation, and approach	<i>Erwin De Nys</i> , Practice Manager (WB); <i>Roy Parizat</i> , Fund Manager; <i>Michael Hoewel</i> , Facilitator
9:15	Country presentations	Each country team will give a 5-minute talk on their program covering timeline, underlying activities, and land-use categories included	<i>Michael Hoewel</i> Facilitator Country representatives
10:15	Individual feedback session	Gather insights and foster discussion from participants on their experience engaging with ISFL and the integrated land use approach	<i>Michael Hoewel</i> Facilitator
10:45	Coffee Break		
11:15	Issue 1: ERPD preparation	Introduction to the topic, presentation of discussion questions	<i>Roy Parizat</i> ISFL Fund Manager
11:30		Breakout session focused on ERPD preparations: strengths, challenges, what could have been done differently	Participants
12:15		Group presentation and discussion	Participants
13:00	Lunch		
14:00	Issue 2: ERPD assessment/ERPA negotiation process	Introduction to the topic, presentation of discussion questions	<i>Evanshainia Syiem</i> Climate Finance Specialist
14:15		Breakout session focused on the scope, duration, successes, and challenges of the ERPD assessment and the ERPA negotiation process	Participants
15:00	Coffee break		
15:15	Issue 2: ERPD assessment/ERPA negotiation process	Group presentation and discussion	Participants
16:00	Contributor panel	Panel discussion: Contributors' outlook on jurisdictional integrated land-use programs Participants and donors to have an open dialogue on program development	Contributor representatives Participants
17:00	Day 1 wrap-up		<i>Michael Hoewel</i> Facilitator

Time	Format	Lead
8:30	Arrival, registration, light breakfast	
9:00	Welcome and opening	Recap of day 1, scene setting for day 2 <i>Michael Hoewel</i> Facilitator
9:15	Issue 3: Benefit sharing	Introduction to the topic, presentation of discussion questions <i>Loic Braune</i> Sr. Natural Resource Specialist
9:30		Breakout session to discuss the benefit sharing development process, potential challenges for implementation, and recommendations for improvement Participants
10:15		Group presentation and discussion Participants
11:30	Coffee break	
11:45	Issue 4: Private sector engagement	Overview of the private sector engagement theory of change, presentation of discussion questions <i>Erin Tressler</i> Private Sector Specialist
12:00		Breakout session to discuss challenges in implementing private sector approaches, what elements were the most impactful, and the role of private sector approaches in jurisdictional programs moving forward Participants
12:45	Lunch	
13:45	Issue 4: Private sector engagement	Report back and discussion on private sector engagement Participants
14:30	Moving forward	Final individual feedback session and discussion of next steps and how the work of the Pause and Reflect will be carried forward <i>Michael Hoewel</i> Facilitator
15:15	Closing <i>Roy Parizat</i> Fund Manager	