

**International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) Carbon Offsetting and Reduction
Scheme for International Aviation (CORSA)**

Application Form for Emissions Unit Programmes

CONTENTS

Section I: About this Assessment

Background

Disclaimer

Section II: Instructions

Submission and contacts

Form basis and cross-references

Form completion

Form scope

Programme revision

“Linked” certification schemes

Disclosure of programme application forms

Section III: Application Form

PART 1: General information

PART 2: Programme summary

PART 3: Emissions Unit Programme Design Elements

PART 4: Carbon Offset Credit Integrity Assessment Criteria

PART 5: Programme comments

Section IV: Signature

SECTION I: ABOUT THIS ASSESSMENT

Background

ICAO Member States and the aviation industry are implementing the Carbon Offsetting and Reduction Scheme for International Aviation (CORSA). Together with other mitigation measures, CORSA will help achieve international aviation's aspirational goal of carbon neutral growth from the year 2020.

Aeroplane operators will meet their offsetting requirements under CORSA by purchasing and cancelling CORSA eligible emissions units. The ICAO Council determines CORSA eligible emissions units upon recommendations by its Technical Advisory Body (TAB) and consistent with the CORSA Emissions Unit Eligibility Criteria (EUC).

In March 2019, the ICAO Council unanimously approved the CORSA Emissions Unit Eligibility Criteria for use by TAB in undertaking its tasks¹. TAB conducted its first cycle of assessment in 2019, and its recommendations were considered by the Council in March 2020.

Now, ICAO invites emissions unit programmes² to apply for the second cycle of assessment by the TAB, which will involve collecting information from each programme through this programme application form and supplementary materials and requested evidence.

Through this assessment, the TAB will develop recommendations on the list of eligible emissions unit programmes (and potentially project types) for use under the CORSA, which will then be considered by the ICAO Council.

This form is accompanied by, and refers to, Appendix A “*Supplementary Information for Assessment of Emissions Unit Programmes*”³, containing the EUC and *Guidelines for Criteria Interpretation*. These EUC and Guidelines are provided to inform programmes' completion of this application form, in which they are cross-referenced **by paragraph number**.

This form is also accompanied by Appendix B “*Programme Assessment Scope*”, and Appendix C “*Programme Exclusions Scope*”, which request all applicants to identify the programme elements⁴ they wish to submit for, or exclude from, TAB's assessment.

This form also requests *evidence of programme procedures or programme elements*. These evidentiary documents enable TAB to a) confirm that a given procedure or program element is *in place*, b) more fully comprehend the programme's summary responses, and c) archive the information as a reference for potential future assessments.

Programme responses to this application form will serve as the primary basis for the assessment. Such assessment may involve e.g. clarification questions, live interview(s) with TAB, and a completeness check of the application, as further requested.

Translation: The working language of the assessment process is English. Translation services are not available for this process. If the programme documents and information are not published in English, the programme should fully describe in English (*rather than summarize*) this information in the fields provided in this form, and in response to any additional questions. Where this form requests *evidence of programme procedures*, programmes are strongly encouraged to provide these documents in English, to provide for accuracy and comprehension. Where this is not possible due to time constraints or document length, the programme may

¹ Available on the ICAO CORSA website: <https://www.icao.int/environmental-protection/CORSA/Pages/CORSA-Emissions-Units.aspx>

² “Emissions Unit Programme”, for the purposes of TAB's assessment, refers to an organization that administers standards and procedures for developing activities that generate offsets, and for verifying and “issuing” offsets created by those activities. For more information, please review the TAB FAQs on the ICAO CORSA website: <https://www.icao.int/environmental-protection/CORSA/Pages/TAB.aspx>

³ Available on the ICAO CORSA website: <https://www.icao.int/environmental-protection/CORSA/Pages/TAB.aspx>

⁴ At the “activity type” level (e.g., sector(s), sub-sector(s), and/or project “type(s)”)

provide such documents in their original language in a readily translatable format (e.g., Microsoft Word). Those programmes that need to translate documents prior to submission may contact the ICAO Secretariat regarding accommodation.

Disclaimer: The information contained in the application, and any supporting evidence or clarification provided by the applicant including information designated as “business confidential” by the applicant, will be provided to the members of the TAB to properly assess the programme and make recommendations to the ICAO Council. The application and such other evidence or clarification will be made publicly available on the ICAO CORSIA website for the public to provide comments, except for information which the applicant designates as “business confidential”. The applicant shall bear all expenses related to the collection of information for the preparation of the application, preparation and submission of the application to the ICAO Secretariat and provision of any subsequent clarification sought by the Secretariat and/or the members of the TAB. Under no circumstances shall ICAO be responsible for the reimbursement of such or any other expenses borne by the applicant in this regard, or any loss or damages that the applicant may incur in relation to the assessment and outcome of this process.

SECTION II: INSTRUCTIONS

Submission and contacts

A programme is invited to complete and submit the form, and accompanying evidence, through the ICAO CORSIA website no later than close of business on **20 April 2020**. Within seven business days of receiving this form, the Secretariat will notify the programme that its form was received.

If the programme has questions regarding the completion of this form, please contact ICAO Secretariat via email: officeenv@icao.int. Programmes will be informed, in a timely manner, of clarifications provided by ICAO to any other programme.

Form basis and cross-references

Questions in this form are derived from the CORSIA emissions unit eligibility criteria (EUC) and any *Guidelines for Criteria Interpretation* introduced in Section I (above). To help inform the programme's completion of this form, each question includes the paragraph number for its corresponding criterion or guideline that can be found in [Appendix A "Supplementary Information for Assessment of Emissions Unit Programmes"](#).

Form completion

The programme should respond to all questions in this application form. A "complete" response involves three components: a) a written summary response, b) selection of the "YES" check box if a procedure is fully *in place*, and c) supporting evidence.

- a) **Written summary responses:** The programme is encouraged to construct written summary responses in a manner that provides for general comprehension of the given programme procedure, independent of supporting evidence. TAB will confirm each response in the supplementary evidence provided by the programme. Please note that written summary responses should be provided in all cases—supporting evidence (described in *c*) below) should not be considered as an alternative to a complete summary response.
- b) **"YES" check box:** Each question is accompanied by a check box for the programme to indicate the status of a given procedure or programme element. Here, programmes should accurately represent the status of its procedures and programme elements. Please note that an unselected check box does not, in itself, disqualify an application from further assessment; it will be taken into account when TAB reviews the programme's accompanying information.

The programme *should* select the "YES" check box if a procedure or element is *in place*.

The programme *should not* select the check box in the following instances:

1. The procedure in question is *not relevant to the programme's application* (if, e.g., the question applies to activity(ies) that the programme is not submitting for assessment, or an alternative approach is taken to the procedure or element in question). In such cases, please provide justification in the written summary response.
 2. The procedure in question is *not yet in place, but the programme is planning to introduce such a procedure*. In such cases, please describe any such plans in the written summary response, according to form instructions.
 3. The procedure in question is *not in place*. In such cases, please provide justification in the written summary response.
- c) **Supporting evidence:** Most questions in this form request *evidence of programme procedures or programme elements*. Such evidence may be found in programme standards, requirements, or guidance documents; templates; programme website or registry contents; or in some cases, in specific methodologies. To help manage file size, the programme should limit supporting documentation to that

which directly substantiates the programme’s statements in this form.

Regarding such requests for evidence, programmes can substantiate their responses in any of these ways (**in order of preference**):

1. web links to supporting documentation included along with the written summary response; with instructions for finding the relevant information within the linked source, if necessary;
2. copying/pasting information directly into this form (no character limits) along with the written summary response;
3. attaching supporting documentation to this form at the time of submission, with instructions for finding the relevant information within the attached document(s);

Form scope

The programme may elect to submit for TAB assessment all, *or only a subset*, of the activities supported by the programme. The programme is requested to identify, in the following Appendices, the activities that it wishes to submit for, or exclude from, TAB’s assessment:

In **Appendix B “Programme Assessment Scope”**, the programme should clearly identify, at the “activity type” level (e.g., sector(s), sub-sector(s), and/or programme/project “type(s)”), elements that the programme **is submitting for TAB’s assessment** of CORSIA eligibility; as well as the specific methodologies, protocols, and/or framework(s) associated with these programme elements; which *are* described in this form.

In **Appendix C “Programme Exclusions Scope”**, the programme should clearly identify, at the “activity type” level (e.g., sector(s), sub-sector(s), and/or programme/project “type(s)”), any elements the programme **is not submitting for TAB’s assessment** of CORSIA eligibility, which *are not* described in this form; as well as the specific methodologies, protocols, and/or framework(s) associated with these programme elements.

Programme revisions

Where the programme has any plans to revise the programme (e.g., its policies, procedures, measures, tracking systems, governance or legal arrangements), including to enhance consistency with a given criterion or guideline, please provide the following information in response to any and all relevant form question(s):

- a) Proposed revision(s);
- b) Process and proposed timeline to develop and implement the proposed revision(s);
- c) Process and timeline for external communication and implementation of the revision(s).

“Linked” certification schemes

This application form should be completed and submitted exclusively on behalf of the programme that is described in Part I of this form.

Some programmes may supplement their standards by collaborating with other schemes that certify, e.g., the social or ecological “co-benefits” of mitigation. The programme can reflect a linked scheme’s procedures in responses to this form, where this is seen as enhancing—i.e. going “above and beyond”—the programme’s own procedures.

For example, the programme may describe how a linked scheme audits sustainable development outcomes; but is not expected to report the linked scheme’s board members or staff persons.

Programmes should clearly identify any information provided in this form that pertains to a linked certification scheme and/or only applies when a linked certification scheme is used.

Disclosure of programme application forms

Applications, including information submitted in Appendices B and C, and other information submitted by applicants will be publicly available on the ICAO CORSIA website, except for materials which the applicants designate as business confidential.

The public will be invited to submit comments on the information submitted, including regarding consistency with the emissions unit criteria (EUC), through the ICAO CORSIA website, for consideration by the TAB in its assessment.

SECTION III: APPLICATION FORM

PART 1: General information

A. Programme Information

Programme name:	<input type="text" value="BioCarbon Fund Initiative for Sustainable Forest Landscapes"/>
Administering Organization ⁵ :	<input type="text" value="The World Bank"/>
Official mailing address:	<input type="text" value="1818 H Street NW, Washington DC 20433"/>
Telephone #:	<input type="text" value="+1(202) 473 1000"/>
Official web address:	<input type="text" value="www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org"/>

B. Programme Administrator Information

Full name and title:	<input type="text" value="Roy Parizat, Fund Manager, BioCarbon Fund ISFL"/>		
Employer / Company (if not programme):	<input type="text" value="The World Bank"/>		
E-mail address:	<input type="text" value="rparizat@worldbank.org"/>	Telephone #:	<input type="text" value="+1 (202) 473 6179"/>

C. Programme Representative Information (if different from Programme Administrator)

Full name and title:	<input type="text"/>		
Employer / Company (if not Programme):	<input type="text"/>		
E-mail address:	<input type="text"/>	Telephone #:	<input type="text"/>

D. Programme Senior Staff / Leadership (e.g., President / CEO, board members)

List the names and titles of programme's senior staff / leadership, including board members:

The BioCarbon Fund Initiative for Sustainable Forest Landscapes (ISFL) is a multilateral fund with the financial contributors, the Kingdom of Norway and Governments of Germany, Switzerland, United Kingdom and United States represented in the governance of the fund.

The World Bank is the Trustee and Secretariat of the ISFL, which is managed by the Climate Funds Management Unit of the Climate Change Group in the Sustainable Development Practice Group of the World Bank.

The ISFL leadership includes Mr. Roy Parizat, Fund Manager, ISFL, Mr. Marc Sadler, Practice Manager, Climate Change Fund Management unit, Ms. Bernice K. Van Bronkhorst, Global Director, Climate Change Group; and Mr. Juergen Voegele, Vice President, Sustainable Development Practice Group.

⁵ Name of the business, government agency, organization, or other entity that administers the Emissions Unit Programme, if different from "Programme Name".

Provide an organization chart (in the space below or as an attachment) that illustrates, or otherwise describes, the functional relationship a) between the individuals listed in D; and b) between those individuals and programme staff / employees; and c) the functions of each organizational unit and interlinkages with other units.



PART 2: Programme summary

Provide a summary description of your programme

BioCarbon Fund was established in 2004 is the first carbon fund established globally with focus on land use piloting the Afforestation and Reforestation, Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+) and Sustainable Agriculture Land Management (SALM) activities.

The ISFL, established in 2013, collaborates with national governments to reduce emissions from land use through smart land use planning, policies and practices. The ISFL promotes and rewards emissions reduction through sustainable land use by REDD+, climate smart agriculture, and smart land use planning and policies at jurisdiction scale. The ISFL vision and approach document is available at the below link:

<https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/documents/ISFL%20Vision.pdf>

The two categories of climate mitigation finance provided by the ISFL are through the BioCF*plus* for upfront investment in support of enabling environment and partnerships, private sector engagement and capacity to monitor, report and verify emission reductions; and Tranche 3 of the BioCarbon Fund, which provides *results-based finance (RBF)* for payments to emissions reductions (ERs) over a 10 year period to reward the outcomes of jurisdictional sustainable land use interventions.

The ISFL ER programs are implemented at a jurisdictional scale with a focus on sustainable land use and climate change mitigation activities targeting agriculture, forestry and other land uses (AFOLU). Each ISFL program utilizes a landscape approach across an entire jurisdiction (sub-national/province/region), one-level below the national jurisdiction, thereby enabling policy interventions and engaging with multiple stakeholders that influence land use decisions. The scale of ISFL ER programs is therefore several times greater than the scale of traditional projects targeting land use activities.

The ER programs of the ISFL must comply with the ISFL ER Program Requirements approved in 2017, which specify eligibility for categories and sub-categories of land use activities to be eligible for implementation and to issue verified and certified ERs from ISFL.

The validation and verification of ISFL ER programs is organized through independent auditors that are accredited under ISO 14065 and ISO 14064-2 by an Accreditation Body that is a signatory of the IAF Multilateral Recognition Arrangement for ISO 14065. The ISFL Validation and Verification Requirements (VVR) outline a set of validation and verification criteria to be assessed and confirmed by the accredited independent auditors.

The certified ISFL ERs issued after verification are managed through a centralized ER Transaction Registry that identifies ERs using a serialization process to assign unique global carbon ticker code to facilitate their tracking and transfer. A record of ER units issued will be catalogued in the Transaction Registry, which has capabilities to uniquely identify the CORSIA eligible ERs. The Transaction Registry has policies and procedures in place that avoid double-issuance, double-use, double-claiming and double-selling of ISFL ERs.

PART 3: Emissions Unit Programme Design Elements

Note—where “evidence” is requested throughout *Part 3* and *Part 4*, the programme should provide web links to documentation. If that is not possible, then the programme may provide evidence of programme procedures directly in the text boxes provided (by copying/pasting the relevant provisions) and/or by attached supporting documentation, as recommended in “SECTION II: INSTRUCTIONS—*Form Completion*”.

Note—“*Paragraph X.X*” in this form refers to corresponding paragraph(s) in Appendix A “Supplementary Information for Assessment of Emissions Unit Programmes”.

Note—Where the programme has any plans to revise the programme (e.g., its policies, procedures, measures, tracking systems, governance or legal arrangements), including to enhance consistency with a given criterion or guideline, provide the following information in response to any and all relevant form question(s):

- Proposed revision(s);
- Process and proposed timeline to develop and implement the proposed revision(s);
- Process and timeline for external communication and implementation of the revision(s).

Question 3.1. Clear methodologies and protocols, and their development process

Provide *evidence*⁶ that the programme’s qualification and quantification methodologies and protocols are *in place* and *available for use*, including where the programme’s existing methodologies and protocols are publicly disclosed: (*Paragraph 2.1*)

The comprehensive landscape accounting approach forms the basis for accounting and reporting of ERs from ISFL ER programs implemented at jurisdictional scale. The ISFL ER Program Requirements approved in 2017 serve as the *standard/methodological* basis for implementing ISFL ER programs. It is disclosed at www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org and is available at the below link:

https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/documents/ISFL%20ER%20Program%20Requirements_2020_Final.pdf

A summary of the ISFL ER Program Requirements is available at the below link:

<https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/documents/ISFL%20ER%20Program%20Requirements%20Booklet.pdf>

Summarize the programme’s process for developing further methodologies and protocols, including the timing and process for revision of existing methodologies: (*Paragraph 2.1*)

ISFL Process Requirements cover the procedures for approval and revisions of ISFL ER Program Requirements, Guidance Notes, Templates and supporting documentation.

Provide *evidence of the public availability* of the programme’s process for developing further methodologies and protocols: (*Paragraph 2.1*)

The ISFL Process Requirements provide details of approval and revisions to ISFL ER Program Requirements, Guidance Notes, Templates are publicly disclosed at the ISFL website and available at the below link.

https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/documents/ISFL%20Process%20Requirements_2020_Final%20%281%29.pdf

⁶ For this and subsequent “evidence” requests, evidence should be provided in the text box (e.g., web links to documentation), and/or in attachments, as recommended in “SECTION II: INSTRUCTIONS—*Form Completion*”.

Question 3.2. Scope considerations

Summarize the level at which activities are allowed under the programme (e.g., project based, programme of activities, jurisdiction-scale): (*Paragraph 2.2*)

ISFL programs are implemented at jurisdictional scale (e.g. sub-national/province/region) that is one level below national jurisdiction. This is noted in the ISFL ER Program Requirements and in addition, Sections 2 and 3 of the ISFL ER Program Document Template presents the scale of implementation of program and is available at the below link:

https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/documents/ISFL%20ER%20Program%20Requirements_2020_Final.pdf

Summarize the eligibility criteria for each type of offset activity (e.g., which sectors, project types, and geographic locations are covered): (*Paragraph 2.2*)

The ISFL promotes a landscape approach to mitigation activities that cover forests, agriculture and other land uses (AFOLU) in a jurisdiction.

Provide *evidence* of the Programme information defining a) level at which activities are allowed under the Programme, and b) the eligibility criteria for each type of offset activity, including its availability to the public: (*Paragraph 2.2*)

Section 3 of the ISFL ER Program Requirements clarify that programs should be implemented at jurisdiction scale and that they demonstrate scale and ambition following integrated landscape approach.

Section 4.3 and Annex 1 of ISFL ER Program Requirements clarify the eligibility criteria of categories and sub-categories of activities eligible for implementation in ER programs; and at the below link.

https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/documents/ISFL%20ER%20Program%20Requirements_2020_Final.pdf

Question 3.3. Offset credit issuance and retirement procedures

Are procedures in place defining how offset credits are... (*Paragraph 2.3*)

a) issued? YES

b) retired / cancelled? YES

c) subject to discounting (*if any*)? YES

Are procedures in place defining... (*Paragraph 2.3*)

d) the length of crediting period(s)? YES

e) whether crediting periods are renewable? YES

Provide evidence of the procedures referred to in a) through e) (if any, in the case of “c”), including their availability to the public:

- a) Procedures for credit issuance are presented in the World Bank Operational Guidelines for Emission Reductions Transaction Registry (Registry Guidelines); pages 98-107; Draft Version: January 14th, 2020. (confidential document available through a private link).
- b) Procedures for retirement/cancellation of credits are presented in the World Bank Operational Guidelines for Emission Reductions Transaction Registry: 119, 122, 125, 126-127, pages 136, 139, 142, and 144; Draft Version: January 14th, 2020 (confidential document available through a private link).
- c) There is no discounting of ER units in the ISFL programs. A portion of program buffer is maintained to manage uncertainty of ERs of ISFL programs.
- d) The length of crediting period under ISFL (a.k.a. ISFL ERPA Phase) is of 5 years maximum. Crediting periods are defined by each ISFL ER Program but shall be at least two and the latest shall not be later than 31 December 2029. Emission Baseline shall be revised in each renewal of the crediting period and shall be subject to Validation (c.f. para 10-12 Validation and Verification Requirements and para. 36 of the Process Requirements available at the below links).
- e) The crediting periods are renewable. The definition of crediting period/ERPA phase is presented in the ISFL Glossary of Terms available at the below link. The ISFL is scheduled to operate until 31 December 2030. The section 10.1 of ISFL Buffer Requirements specifies that one year before the end of the Term of the ISFL, an ER Program shall have in place a robust Reversal Management Mechanism equivalent to the ER Program Buffer and addresses the risk of Reversals beyond the Term of the ISFL. If an ER Program wishes to supply CORSIA Eligible Emissions Units during post-2030 period, the ER Program shall have in place a robust Reversal Management Mechanism that: addresses the risk of Reversals beyond the Term of the ISFL; is equivalent to the ER Program Buffer; and shall be continually managed and operated by a CORSIA Eligible Emissions Unit Programme which administers comparable multi-decadal Programme elements included in its scope of eligibility; and that the Reversal Management Mechanism of CORSIA Eligible Emissions Unit Programme shall compensate for any material reversals for at least until 15 years following the end of the ISFL in 2030 (i.e. 31 December 2045). This information is clarified in the section 10.1 of ISFL Buffer Requirements; and in the section 7.8 of ISFL Process Requirements available at the below links.

ISFL Glossary of Terms

https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/documents/ISFL%20Glossary%20of%20Terms_2020_Final.pdf

ISFL Process Requirements

https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/documents/ISFL%20Process%20Requirements_2020_Final%20%281%29.pdf

ISFL Validation and Verification Requirements

https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/documents/ISFL%20Validation%20and%20Verification%20Requirements_2020_Final%20%281%29.pdf

ISFL ER Program Buffer Requirements

https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/documents/ISFL%20Buffer%20Requirements_2020_Final.pdf

Question 3.4 Identification and Tracking

Does the programme utilize an electronic registry or registries? (*Paragraph 2.4.2*)

YES

Provide web link(s) to the programme registry(ies) and indicate whether the registry is administered by the programme or outsourced to a third party (*Paragraph 2.4.2*):

The ISFL plans to issue and track ERs using the World Bank Emission Reduction Transaction Registry, an electronic registry (henceforth referred as ER Transaction Registry or the registry). The registry development has been completed and internal review is in progress prior to public disclosure. The registry documentation (Terms & Conditions; Operational Guidelines and User Manual) is therefore submitted with a separate link and should be considered confidential until it is publicly disclosed at the ISFL website.

Does the programme have procedures in place to ensure that the programme registry or registries....:

- a) have the capability to transparently identify emissions units that are deemed ICAO-eligible, in all account types ? (Paragraph 2.4.3) YES
- b) identify, and facilitate tracking and transfer of, unit ownership/holding from issuance to cancellation/retirement? (Paragraphs 2.4 (a) and (d) and 2.4.4) YES
- c) identify unit status, including retirement / cancellation, and issuance status? (Paragraph 2.4.4) YES
- d) assign unique serial numbers to issued units? (Paragraphs 2.4 (b) and 2.4.5) YES
- e) identify in serialization, or designate on a public platform, each unique unit's country and sector of origin, vintage, and original (and, if relevant, revised) project registration date? (Paragraph 2.4.5) YES
- f) are secure (i.e. that robust security provisions are in place)? (Paragraph 2.4 (c)) YES

Summarize and provide evidence of the procedures referred to in a) through f), including the availability to the public of the procedures referred to in b), d), and f):

The ER Transaction Registry has the capabilities to designate the ICAO eligible units, identify unit status from issuance, retirement/cancellation, uniquely serialize units, designate a country's origin, vintage of credits, track and transfer unit ownership from issuance to retirement/cancellation accounts. The registry procedures ensure traceability, transparency, efficiency, environmental Integrity and ISFL compliance requirements.

- a) The ER Transaction Registry designates the status of issued ER units, including identification of CORSIA eligible ERs in the Transaction Registry.
- b) The workflow of the registry can track ER units across multiple accounts such as recording, issuance, tradable, retirement, reversal and cancellation accounts.
- c) The ER Transaction Registry can identify units at each stage from recording to retirement/cancellation.
- d) The serialization function in the ER Transaction Registry assigns global carbon ticket code following the data exchange protocol of International Transaction Log (ITL) that uniquely identifies the status of emission reductions from issuance to retirement/cancellation.
- e) The serialization function in the ER Transaction Registry allows for identification by country, sector, vintage, project registration and credit issuance.

The procedures referred to in a) through e) are described in detail in the World Bank Operational Guidelines for Emission Reductions Transaction Registry: pages 98-101. Draft Version: January 14th, 2020. Confidential document temporarily available in a private link shared separately along with this application.

- f) The ER Transaction Registry has robust security provisions to ensure that credits managed in the registry are secure.

The ER Transaction Registry has robust security provisions to ensure that the credits managed in the registry are secure. The Information Security (OIS) accreditation process for the Registry within the WB has been completed and the registry achieved the technical readiness for deployment in production (software testing, system integration testing and user acceptance testing) and got the internal technical clearance as required (OIS Clearance & Accreditation (C&A) clearance). A robust KYC (Know your Customer) sanctions screening solution through Lexis Nexis has been implemented for entities and users. This service is operative when creating/editing an entity/user and at the end of the day batch process.

The registry documentation and website are undergoing internal review and will be publicly disclosed upon conclusion of review. The documentation on the World Bank Operational Guidelines for Emission Reductions Transaction Registry, Draft Version: January 14th, 2020 is confidential and is available as a private link shared separately along with this application.

List any/all international data exchange standards to which the programme's registry(ies) conform: (*Paragraph 2.4 (f)*)

The ER Transaction Registry conforms with the data exchange standard of International Transaction Log (ITL) operated under the UNFCCC (see the World Bank Operational Guidelines for Emission Reductions Transaction Registry: pg. 98-101).

Are policies and robust procedures in place to...

- a) prevent the programme registry administrators from having financial, commercial or fiduciary conflicts of interest in the governance or provision of registry services? (*Paragraph 2.4.6*) YES
- b) ensure that, where such conflicts arise, they are appropriately declared, and addressed and isolated? (*Paragraph 2.4.6*) YES

Summarize and provide evidence of the policies and procedures referred to in a) and b):

The ER Transaction Registry has policies and procedures in place to avoid conflicts of interests in the provision of registry services:

- a) The Terms and Conditions; and Operational Guidelines of the registry have provisions to avoid conflict of interest associated with governance or provision of registry services. The governance system consists of a minimum of two-level clearance system, with the participation of the program entity and after the final approval by the Administrator, Trust Fund Manager or Buffer Manager that have registry responsibilities.
- b) The Terms and Conditions (Article XXII) of the registry have measures in place to address conflicts of interest when they arise.

Documentation on the World Bank Terms and Conditions and Operational Guidelines for Emission Reductions Transaction Registry. Draft Version: January 14th, 2020 is confidential and submitted in a separate link.

Are provisions in place...

- a) ensuring the screening of requests for registry accounts? (*Paragraph 2.4.7*) YES
- b) restricting the programme registry (or registries) accounts to registered businesses and individuals? (*Paragraph 2.4.7*) YES
- c) ensuring the periodic audit or evaluation of registry compliance with security provisions? (*Paragraph 2.4.8*) YES

Summarize and provide evidence of the registry security provisions referred to in a) through c):

The ER Transaction Registry has provisions for application of:

- a) Multi-layered screening of requests for registry access to different registry accounts.
- b) Protocols restricting access to registered and verified accounts to registered entities based on specific access criteria.
- c) Procedures for periodic audits and reporting of the registry's compliance with security requirements.

A robust KYC (Know your Customer) sanctions screening solution through WB Lexis Nexis services has been implemented. This service is operative when creating/editing an entity/user and at the end of the day batch process. The accounts are only accessible for the registered and approved entities and users.

A yearly independent audit report certifying that the WB ER transaction registry performs required functions will be prepared and made public.

Documentation on the World Bank Operational Guidelines for Emission Reductions Transaction Registry. Draft Version: January 14th, 2020 is confidential and submitted in a separate link.

Question 3.5 Legal nature and transfer of units

Does the programme define and ensure the underlying attributes and property aspects of a unit? (*Paragraph 2.5*) YES

Summarize and provide evidence of *the process by which the programme defines and ensures the underlying attributes and property aspects of a unit*, including its availability to the public:

The ISFL requires ER programs to demonstrate the ability to transfer title (i.e. legal and beneficial ownership) to ERs. The ISFL Guidance Note on the Ability of Program Entity to Transfer Title to Emission Reductions clarifies which requirements, evidence and due diligence must be implemented to demonstrate the ability of a country implementing an ER program to transfer title to ERs; and is available at the below link:

<https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/documents/ISFL%20Guidance%20Note%20on%20the%20Ability%20to%20Transfer%20Title%20April%202020%20Final.pdf>

Section 3.7 of the ISFL ER Program Document Template requires programs to present information on a program entity's ability to transfer title to ERs to the ISFL. As part of this demonstration, a discussion on the implications of the land and resource regime on the ability to transfer title to ERs needs to be presented. The ability to transfer title to ERs can be demonstrated through various means, including reference to existing legal and regulatory frameworks, sub-arrangements with potential land and resource tenure rights, and/or benefit sharing arrangements under a Benefit Sharing Plan.

Question 3.6 Validation and verification procedures

Are standards, requirements, and procedures in place for... (*Paragraph 2.6*)

- a) the validation of activities? YES
- b) the verification of emissions reductions? YES
- c) the accreditation of validators? YES
- d) the accreditation of verifiers? YES

Provide evidence of the standards, requirements, and procedures referred to in a) through d), including their availability to the public:

Section 6 of the ISFL ER Program Requirements specifies that ER programs shall be validated and verified using independent third-party auditors.

The ISFL Validation and Verification Requirements (VVR) provide detailed set of provisions to be applied by accredited third-party auditors to ensure that Validation and Verification criteria of ISFL are fulfilled.

a) Validation of program activities

The ISFL requires validation of program activities to occur prior to the first verification. Per section 8.2 of VVR, accredited Validation Bodies conduct validation of ER programs to ensure that information provided in the ISFL ER Program Document is correct and complete; and is in conformity with the ISFL ER Program Requirements.

b) Verification of emission reductions

Verification of ERs is to be conducted by accredited Verification Bodies. Verifications align with Reporting Periods of a crediting period (a.k.a. ISFL ERPA Phase). The verification is expected to ensure that ERs are estimated transparently, enable reconstruction, are materially accurate and have uncertainty assessed. Section 8.2 of the VVR clarifies the objectives of verification.

c) and d) Accreditation of validators and verifiers

The VVR has provisions for Validation and Verification Bodies to be accredited under ISO 14065 for scope ISO 14064-2, specifically for Land Use and Forestry by an Accreditation Body that is a signatory of the IAF Multilateral Recognition Arrangement (MLA) for ISO 14065. The ISFL seeks proposals from accredited VVBs for conducting validation and verification engagements of ER programs.

The ISFL Validation and Verification Requirements are publicly disclosed at the link below.

https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/documents/ISFL%20Validation%20and%20Verification%20Requirements_2020_Final%20%281%29.pdf

Question 3.7 Programme governance

Does the programme publicly disclose who is responsible for the administration of the programme? (*Paragraph 2.7*) YES

Does the programme publicly disclose how decisions are made? (*Paragraph 2.7*) YES

Provide evidence that this information is available to the public:

The World Bank is the trustee of the ISFL on behalf of financial contributors. The Fund Management Team based in Climate Change Group of the World Bank administers the ISFL. An overview of the ISFL, its Requirements, procedures and program documentation are publicly disclosed at <https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/>

Can the programme demonstrate that it has... (*Paragraph 2.7.2*)

a) been continuously governed and operational for at least the last two years? YES

b) been continuously operational for at least the last two years? YES

c) a plan for the long-term administration of multi-decadal programme elements? YES

d) a plan for possible responses to the dissolution of the programme in its current form? YES

Provide evidence of the activities, policies, and procedures referred to in a) through d):

a) and b) The ISFL was launched at the UNFCCC 19th Conference of Parties meeting (COP19) in Warsaw in 2013 and has been operational since then. The information on the operation of ISFL is available at: <https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/>

c) The ISFL is expected to be operational until 31 December 2030 and any decisions on its extension would be expected to be made prior to the end of its term.

d) Section 10.1 of the ISFL Buffer Requirements specifies that one year before the end of the Term of the ISFL, an ER program shall have in place a robust Reversal Management Mechanism equivalent to the ER Program Buffer and addresses the risk of Reversals beyond the Term of the ISFL. If an ER Program wishes to supply CORSIA Eligible Emissions Units during post-2030 period, the ER Program shall have in place a robust Reversal Management Mechanism that: addresses the risk of Reversals beyond the Term of the ISFL; is equivalent to the ER Program Buffer; and shall be continually managed and operated by a CORSIA Eligible Emissions Unit Programme which administers comparable multi-decadal Programme elements included in its scope of eligibility; and that the Reversal Management Mechanism of CORSIA Eligible Emissions Unit Programme shall compensate for any material reversals for at least until 15 years following the end of the ISFL in 2030 (i.e. 31 December 2045). This information is clarified in section 10.1 of ISFL Buffer Requirements; and in the section 7.8 of ISFL Process Requirements available at the below links:

ISFL Buffer Requirements

[https://www.biocarbonfund-](https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/documents/ISFL%20Buffer%20Requirements_2020_Final.pdf)

[isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/documents/ISFL%20Buffer%20Requirements_2020_Final.pdf](https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/documents/ISFL%20Buffer%20Requirements_2020_Final.pdf)

ISFL Process Requirements

[https://www.biocarbonfund-](https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/documents/ISFL%20Process%20Requirements_2020_Final%20%281%29.pdf)

[isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/documents/ISFL%20Process%20Requirements_2020_Final%20%281%29.pdf](https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/documents/ISFL%20Process%20Requirements_2020_Final%20%281%29.pdf)

Are policies and robust procedures in place to...

a) prevent the programme staff, board members, and management from having financial, commercial or fiduciary conflicts of interest in the governance or provision of programme services? (*Paragraph 2.7.3*) YES

b) ensure that, where such conflicts arise, they are appropriately declared, and addressed and isolated? (*Paragraph 2.7.3*) YES

Summarize and provide evidence of the policies and procedures referred to in a) and b):

a) The ISFL is a trust fund of the World Bank. The Fund Management Team (FMT) located in the Climate Change Fund Management Unit of the Sustainable Development Practice Group acts as the Secretariat, administers the trust fund, and organizes the validation and verification of ER programs to ensure compliance with the ISFL ER Program Requirements. The processes implemented through the ISFL Process Requirements avoids conflict of interest at different stages of the program cycle.

i) Administration of BioCarbon Fund ISFL trust fund

World Bank Operational Policy (OP) 14.40 provides an overarching policy framework for administration of trust funds, including the ISFL. It sets out requirements for establishment, implementation, reporting, auditing and evaluation of funds administered by the World Bank. The World Bank Operational Policy (OP) 14.40 is available at the below link.

<https://ispan.worldbank.org/sites/ppf3/PPFDocuments/090224b08231c123.pdf>

ii) Selection of ER programs

ISFL ER programs are selected through ISFL governance procedures per the section 7.1 of ISFL Process Requirements, in which the World Bank Global Practices that coordinate program implementation do not have any role to provide recommendations or views in relation to program selection.

iii) Validation and verification of ER programs

The FMT seeks proposals from accredited third-party Validation and Verification Bodies (VVB) to conduct validation of programs and verification of emission reductions from programs. The VVBs are required to be accredited under ISO 14065 for scope ISO 14064-2 by an Accreditation Body that is a signatory of the IAF Multilateral Recognition Arrangement (MLA) for ISO 14065.

iii) Procedures for commercial negotiations

The FMT coordinates commercial negotiations related to an ER Purchase Agreement (ERPA) on behalf of ISFL Contributors with national agencies of countries implementing ER programs. The World Bank Global Practice staff have no role in the ERPA negotiation process except for general facilitation to national agencies, if necessary.

iv) Fiduciary and legal procedures

Fiduciary and legal procedures of the ERPAs are coordinated by the FMT as trustee of ISFL; while the decisions to exercise legal remedies under the Legal Agreements of ongoing, but separate, World Bank-financed projects are managed by the Country Management Units. Neither legal documents (ERPA or Legal Agreement of separate World Bank-finance projects) provide for “cross-default” clauses in case of a default in the respective other legal documentation. In other words, the fiduciary and legal procedures ensure that a default under one legal documentation does not automatically trigger a default under another legal documentation.

b) The institutional accountability mechanisms implemented in the World Bank ensure that conflicts that arise are appropriately declared, isolated and addressed in a transparent and systematic manner. These include:

i) Inspection Panel

Inspection Panel has the power to carry out independent investigations of World Bank-financed projects to determine whether the Bank follows its operational policies and procedures. The Panel reports its findings to the Bank’s Board of Executive Directors; and the Bank Management is required to prepare a response with recommendations and actions to address the Panel’s findings. The mandate and procedures of the Inspection Panel are available at the below link.

<http://ewebapps.worldbank.org/apps/ip/Pages/AboutUs.aspx>

ii) Grievance Redress Service (GRS)

Individuals and communities, or their representatives may make complaints to the World Bank’s Grievance Redress Service (GRS) if they believe they are or may be directly and adversely affected by an active World Bank-supported project. The GRS ensures that grievances are promptly reviewed and responded to by the responsible units in the World Bank. The GRS notifies the complainant(s) of receipt of the complaint and within 30 business days of acceptance of a complaint, the GRS communicates a proposal to complainant(s) with an action plan and timeframe for its implementation.

<http://www.worldbank.org/en/projects-operations/products-and-services/grievance-redress-service>

iii) Integrity

Integrity Vice Presidency (INT) is an independent unit within World Bank Group (WBG) to investigate and pursue sanctions related to allegations of fraud and corruption in WBG-financed operations. The INT supports WBG business units and external stakeholders to mitigate fraud and corruption risks and provides guidance on business processes and fiduciary controls to ensure the integrity of operations.

<http://www.worldbank.org/en/about/unit/integrity-vice-presidency>

programme is not directly and currently administered by a public agency, can the programme demonstrate up-to-date professional liability insurance policy of at least USD\$5M? (Paragraph 2.7.4)

YES

Provide evidence of such coverage:

The World Bank is the Trustee of the ISFL; and has aggregate professional liability insurance coverage exceeding USD 5 million.

Question 3.8 Transparency and public participation provisions

Does the programme publicly disclose... (Paragraph 2.8)

- a) what information is captured and made available to different stakeholders? YES
- b) its local stakeholder consultation requirements (if applicable)? YES
- c) its public comments provisions and requirements, and how they are considered (if applicable)? YES

Provide evidence of the public availability of items a) through c):

ISFL stakeholder engagement covers a wide range of government and non-government stakeholders such as Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), Indigenous Peoples (IPs), marginalized populations, and the private sector at both the Initiative and Program levels for implementation and management of programs.

a) The ISFL follows the World Bank Information Policy on information disclosure to enable access to information in a transparent manner. ISFL ER programs are required to consult with relevant stakeholder groups on a regular basis and share information on design and implementation of their program. Section 3.2 of the ER Program Document Template requires ER programs to present details on stakeholder information sharing and consultation mechanisms or structures in a form, manner and language understandable to the affected stakeholders and description of how stakeholder feedback was incorporated in the ER program design. During implementation, programs are expected to present plans for consultations, publications and other information and mechanisms used for receiving and responding to feedback. The programs should also present information on stakeholder outreach and consultation process.

b) ISFL stakeholder engagement at local level requires the program entity to engage with relevant stakeholders in the program jurisdiction continuously through design, implementation and distribution of program benefits. Stakeholders may include relevant government agencies, formal and informal stakeholder groups, private sector entities, IPs, communities dependent on landscapes, research and academic institutions, local experts, CSOs and local entrepreneurs. Section 3.4.2 of the ISFL ER Program Requirements specify that Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) procedures should be made public at local level in a language through communications materials, including brochures which explain about the FGRM value chain, focal points, the process and timelines understandable to relevant stakeholders. Stakeholder consultations in relation to programs' benefit sharing arrangements must inform the development of Benefit Sharing Plans, including clarifying the Monetary and Non-Monetary Benefits to be shared among program beneficiaries. Programs are also encouraged to include stakeholders in decision-making, monitoring, and reporting procedures for benefit sharing arrangements.

c) The ISFL requires programs to seek public comments through stakeholder consultations during design, implementation, review and evaluation stages using FGRM. An FGRM can be developed on an ISFL ER Program-specific basis or use an existing mechanism that is assessed equivalent by the World Bank so that FGRM provides opportunities to stakeholders to share comments and feedback on a continuous basis during program implementation. Section 3.4 of ISFL ER Program Requirements mandate programs to identify suitable FGRM prior to implementation of ISFL ER Program activities.

The ISFL approach to social inclusion and stakeholder engagement is available at the below links:

<https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/social-inclusion-and-stakeholder-engagement>

<https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/FINAL%20ISFL%20Stakeholder%20Engagement%20Approach.pdf>

The ISFL approach to private sector engagement is available at the below links:

<https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/private-sector-engagement>

<https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/documents/ISFL%20Private%20Sector%20Engagement%20Approach.pdf>

The note on benefit sharing for ER programs clarifies stakeholder engagement in benefit sharing arrangements in ISFL programs and is available at the below link:

https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/documents/ISFL%20Guidance%20note%20on%20Benefit%20Sharing_july%202019_Final.pdf

Does the programme conduct public comment periods relating to... (*Paragraph 2.8*)

- a) methodologies, protocols, or frameworks under development? YES
- b) activities seeking registration or approval? YES
- c) operational activities (e.g., ongoing stakeholder feedback) YES
- d) additions or revisions to programme procedures or rulesets? YES

Summarize and provide evidence of any programme procedures referred to in a) through d):

The ISFL seeks public comments at various stages of program cycle.

- a) Paragraph 16, section 6 of ISFL Process Requirements requires eliciting public comments for new versions of the ISFL ER Program Requirements (equivalent to methodologies/protocols/frameworks referred above).
- b) Public comments on programs seeking ISFL approval/registration are elicited as part of stakeholder consultations carried out as part of program design prior to submission of programs for ISFL approval.
- c) Public comments on operational activities are elicited through ongoing stakeholder consultations and feedback following the procedures of FGRM operational as clarified in response to item c) of Question 3.8 (Transparency and public participation provisions) above.
- d) Comments and feedback from stakeholder consultations and program implementation are utilized to revise or update the ISFL Process Requirements and other supporting documentation.

Question 3.9 Safeguards system

Are safeguards in place to address... (*Paragraph 2.9*)

a) environmental risks? YES

b) social risks? YES

Summarize and provide evidence of the safeguards referred to in a) and b), including their availability to the public:

ISFL ER programs are expected to comply with the World Bank's Environmental and Social Framework (ESF) that ensures broad and systematic coverage of environmental and social risks associated with the ER programs. The ESF offers broad and systematic coverage of environmental and social risks. It emphasizes transparency, non-discrimination, public participation, and accountability and expanded roles for grievance redressal mechanisms. The ESF utilizes 10 environmental and social standards (ESS) to avoid, minimize, reduce or mitigate the adverse environmental and social risks and impacts of programs.

In support of environmental and social risk mitigation, ISFL programs are expected to have in place an FGRM and free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) to ensure that grievances associated with the ESF are addressed in a formal, transparent, cost effective, and time bound manner.

ISFL ER programs are also expected to prepare formal documentation Strategic Environmental and Social Assessments (SESA), Environmental and Social Assessments (ESMF) and other relevant documentation to assess and manage environmental and social risks of ER program interventions in an inclusive and participatory manner through active engagement of relevant stakeholders.

The information on World Bank Environmental and Social Framework is available at the below link.

<https://www.worldbank.org/en/projects-operations/environmental-and-social-framework>

World Bank Environmental and Social Framework (ESF) documentation is available at the below link.

<http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/837721522762050108/Environmental-and-Social-Framework.pdf>

Additional resources on the application of World Bank Environmental and Social Framework are available at the below link.

<https://www.worldbank.org/en/projects-operations/environmental-and-social-framework/brief/environmental-and-social-framework-resources>

3.10 Sustainable development criteria

Does the programme use sustainable development criteria? (*Paragraph 2.10*)

YES

Does the programme have provisions for monitoring, reporting and verification in accordance with these criteria? (*Paragraph 2.10*)

YES

Summarize and provide evidence of the policies and procedures referred to above:

The World Bank Group Strategy sets out goals of ending extreme poverty and promoting shared prosperity in all its partner countries. Securing the long-term future of the planet, its people and its resources, ensuring social inclusion, and limiting the economic burdens on future generations will underpin these efforts. The twin goals of ending extreme poverty and promoting shared prosperity emphasize the importance of economic growth, inclusion and sustainability, including strong concerns for equity. The World Bank Vision for Sustainable Development is presented in **pages 1-2** of the World Bank Environmental and Social Framework and is available at the below link:

<http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/837721522762050108/Environmental-and-Social-Framework.pdf#page=15&zoom=80>

Assessing and reporting on sustainable development criteria is a key priority for ISFL programs. ER Programs are expected to monitor and report on multiple sustainable development criteria. Section 3.3 of the ISFL ER Program Requirements mandates programs to monitor and report on non-carbon benefits covering broader social and environmental benefits beyond ERs. These relate to the contribution of the ER program to sustainable development and include criteria related to program contributions to improving local livelihoods, building transparent and effective forest governance structures, making progress on securing land tenure and enhancing or maintaining biodiversity and other ecosystem services.

Section 3.3 of the ISFL ER Program Document Template requires programs to document the indicators it will use to monitor and report on non-carbon benefits. In addition, section 3.6 of the ISFL ER Program Document Template requires programs to present the types and scale of benefits associated with the ER program and how the benefits will be shared among various beneficiaries to ensure program contribution to sustainable development.

The ISFL Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) Framework encompasses key building blocks for effective monitoring, evaluation, and learning of the ISFL's approach and performance through December 2030. The two building blocks upon which the ISFL MEL Framework rests are the Theory of Change and log-frame, which together provide a strategic overview of the ISFL and support decision-making by illustrating the main results to be achieved by the ISFL at various levels, and their associated performance indicators. The theory of change highlights the ISFL's alignment with sustainable development goals and the log-frame includes specific indicators to measure the ISFL's contribution to sustainable development. The ISFL MEL Framework covers Initiative-level and program-level monitoring and evaluation that allow for reporting on performance, including adaptive management and learning. The ISFL MEL Framework on monitoring and reporting criteria provide program-level information and progress on improved livelihoods, increased agricultural productivity, and sustainable land use covered under multiple UN Sustainable Development Goals (1- Poverty; 2- End hunger through Sustainable Agriculture; 13 - Climate Action, and 15 – Life on Land) applicable to ER programs.

ISFL Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) Framework is available at the below link:

<https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/documents/ISFL%20MEL%20Framework%20June%202019.pdf>

Does the Programme provide information on how it addresses double counting, issuance and claiming in the context of evolving national and international regimes for carbon markets and emissions trading? (*Paragraph 2.11*)

YES

Summarize and provide evidence of the information referred to above, including its availability to the public:

3.11 Avoidance of double counting, issuance and claiming

Per section 3.7 of the ISFL ER Program Requirements, programs are expected to coordinate with host countries to select appropriate arrangements to avoid double counting, including double issuance, double selling/use, or double claiming, in order to track the ERs to ensure that any ERs that have been generated, monitored and verified under the ISFL ER Program and paid for by the ISFL are not used again by any entity for sale, public relations, compliance or any other purpose unless otherwise agreed by the parties to the ERPA and, where relevant, consistent with any applicable guidance adopted under the Paris Agreement. The ER Transaction Registry has capabilities to register, track, and as appropriate retire or cancel ER units generated under ISFL ER Programs.

The link to the ISFL ER Program Requirements is below:

https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/documents/ISFL%20ER%20Program%20Requirements_2020_Final.pdf

Documentation on the World Bank Operational Guidelines for Emission Reductions Transaction Registry, Draft Version: January 14th, 2020 is submitted in a separate link and should be considered confidential.

PART 4: Carbon Offset Credit Integrity Assessment Criteria

Note—where “evidence” is requested throughout *Part 3* and *Part 4*, the Programme should provide web links to documentation. If that is not possible, then the programme may provide evidence of programme procedures directly in the text boxes provided (by copying/pasting the relevant provisions) and/or by attached supporting documentation, as recommended in “SECTION II: INSTRUCTIONS—*Form Completion*”.

Note—“*Paragraph X.X*” in this form refers to corresponding paragraph(s) in Appendix A “Supplementary Information for Assessment of Emissions Unit Programmes”.

Note—Where the programme has any plans to revise the programme (e.g., its policies, procedures, measures, tracking systems, governance or legal arrangements), including to enhance consistency with a given criterion or guideline, provide the following information in response to any and all relevant form question(s):

- Proposed revision(s);
- Process and proposed timeline to develop and implement the proposed revision(s);
- Process and timeline for external communication and implementation of the revision(s).

Question 4.1 Are additional

Do the Programme’s carbon offsets... (*Paragraph 3.1*)

- a) represent greenhouse gas emissions reductions or carbon sequestration or removals that exceed any greenhouse gas reduction or removals required by law, regulation, or legally binding mandate? YES
- b) exceed any greenhouse gas reductions or removals that would otherwise occur in a conservative, business-as-usual scenario? YES

Summarize and provide evidence of the policies and procedures referred to in a) and b), including their availability to the public:

Additionality of ISFL ER programs is reflected through application of conservative baseline represented as an average annual historical GHG emissions and removals of activities in the program jurisdictions over a baseline period of 10 years. Hence, additionality is demonstrated in terms of the excess GHG reductions or removals relative to a conservative emissions baseline.

Section 4 of the ISFL ER Program Requirements (GHG reporting and accounting) covers provisions related to baseline emissions, monitoring of program emissions and removals and determination of ERs for programs.

Is additionality and baseline-setting... (*Paragraph 3.1*)

- a) assessed by an accredited and independent third-party verification entity? YES
- b) reviewed by the programme? YES

Summarize and provide evidence of the policies and procedures referred to in a) and b), including their availability to the public:

Section 6 of the ISFL ER Program Requirements specify that ER programs shall be validated and verified using independent accredited third-party auditors; and is available at the below link:

[https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/documents/ISFL%20ER%20Program%20Requirements 2020 Final.pdf](https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/documents/ISFL%20ER%20Program%20Requirements%202020%20Final.pdf)

The ISFL Validation and Verification Requirements (VVR) provides a detailed set of requirements to be followed by third-party accredited auditors to ensure that ISFL Validation and Verification criteria are fulfilled; and is available at the below link:

[https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/documents/ISFL%20Validation%20and%20Verification%20Requirements 2020 Final%20%281%29.pdf](https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/documents/ISFL%20Validation%20and%20Verification%20Requirements%202020%20Final%20%281%29.pdf)

Identify one or more of the methods below that the programme has procedures in place to ensure, and to support activities to analyze and demonstrate, that credited mitigation is additional; which can be applied at the project- and/or programme-level: (*Paragraphs 3.1, and 3.1.2 - 3.1.3*)

- Barrier analysis
- Common practice / market penetration analysis
- Investment, cost, or other financial analysis
- Performance standards / benchmarks
- Legal or regulatory additionality analysis (as defined in *Paragraph 3.1*)

Summarize and provide evidence of the policies and procedures referred to in the above list, including describing any/all additionality analyses and test types that are utilized under the programme:

The ISFL ER Program Requirements align with the UNFCCC Warsaw Framework for REDD+ and IPCC Guidelines and Guidance on Agriculture, Forest and Other Land Use (AFOLU) for establishment of baseline of emissions and removals in a jurisdiction. In accordance with these decisions, baseline of a jurisdiction is expressed in tonnes of CO₂ equivalent per year over a baseline period. Thus, the baseline serves as the benchmark for assessing the performance of ISFL program interventions in a jurisdiction (sub-national/province/region), which is one level below national scale. The use of this benchmark is consistent with the above checked item (D) of criteria 3.1.2 on additionality tests referred in the Program Application Form, Appendix A - Supplementary Information for Assessment of Emissions Unit Programmes.

If the Programme provides for the use of method(s) not listed above, describe the alternative procedures and how they ensure that activities are additional: (*Paragraph 3.1*)

Not Applicable

If the programme designates certain activities as automatically additional (e.g., through a “positive list” of eligible project types), does the programme provide clear evidence on how the activity was determined to be additional? (*Paragraph 3.1*) YES

Summarize and provide evidence of the policies and procedures for determining the automatic additionality of activities, including a) the criteria used to determine additionality and b) their availability to the public:

Not Applicable

Explain how the procedures described under Question 4.1 provide a reasonable assurance that the mitigation would not have occurred in the absence of the offset programme: (*Paragraph 3.1*)

Section 2 of the ISFL ER Program Requirements requires that ER Programs are ambitious, implemented at a jurisdictional scale and demonstrate the landscape approach to climate change mitigation; and provides assurance that mitigation would not have occurred in the absence of ER programs interventions.

Question 4.2 Are based on a realistic and credible baseline

Are procedures in place to... (*Paragraph 3.2*)

a) issue emissions units against realistic, defensible, and conservative baseline estimations of emissions? YES

b) publicly disclose baselines and underlying assumptions? YES

Summarize and provide evidence of the policies and procedures referred to in a) and b), including how “*conservativeness*” of baselines and underlying assumptions is defined and ensured:

Section 4 of the ISFL ER Program Requirements on GHG reporting and accounting requires that the emissions baseline of a jurisdiction is represented as an average annual historical GHG emissions and removals of activities over a baseline period of 10 years, which results in an emissions baseline that is most conservative as it reflects the historical emissions average of the baseline period without consideration of any increasing trends in baseline emissions near to the program start date. The ER Program Document Template Section 4 on GHG Accounting and Reporting; and Section 4.4 on Emissions Baseline for ISFL accounting require programs to disclose data, methods and procedures used for estimation of emissions baseline. The ISFL ER Program Document Template is available at the below link.

https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/documents/ISFL%20PD%20Template_January%202020.docx

YES

Are procedures in place to ensure that *methods of developing baselines*, including modelling, benchmarking or the use of historical data, use assumptions, methodologies, and values do not over-estimate mitigation from an activity? (*Paragraph 3.2.2*)

Summarize and provide evidence of the policies and procedures referred to above:

Sections 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4 of the ISFL ER Program Requirements clarify requirements for data quality, methods, baseline period, and spatial information for eligible categories and sub-categories of emissions and removals. Thus, ensuring conservativeness of the baseline and avoiding overestimation of mitigation impact of program interventions. The information is available at the below link.

https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/documents/ISFL%20ER%20Program%20Requirements_2020_Final.pdf

Are procedures in place for activities to respond, as appropriate, to changing baseline conditions that were not expected at the time of registration? (*Paragraph 3.2.3*) YES

Summarize and provide evidence of the policies and procedures referred to above:

The baseline approach of average annual historical GHG emissions and removals of activities over a baseline period of 10 years results in the most conservative emissions baseline as the scenarios of changing baseline conditions are not anticipated.

Question 4.3 Are quantified, monitored, reported, and verified

Are procedures in place to ensure that...

- a) emissions units are based on accurate measurements and valid quantification methods/protocols? (*Paragraph 3.3*) YES
- b) validation occurs prior to or in tandem with verification? (*Paragraph 3.3.2*) YES
- c) the results of validation and verification are made publicly available? (*Paragraph 3.3.2*) YES
- d) monitoring, measuring, and reporting of both activities and the resulting mitigation is conducted at *specified intervals* throughout the duration of the crediting period? (*Paragraph 3.3*) YES
- e) mitigation is measured and verified by an accredited and independent third-party verification entity? (*Paragraph 3.3*) YES
- f) *ex-post* verification of mitigation is required in advance of issuance of emissions units? (*Paragraph 3.3*) YES

Are provisions in place... (*Paragraph 3.3.3*)

- a) to manage and/or prevent conflicts of interest between accredited third-party(ies) performing the validation and/or verification procedures, and the programme and the activities it supports? YES
- b) requiring accredited third-party(ies) to disclose whether they or any of their family members are dealing in, promoting, or otherwise have a fiduciary relationship with anyone promoting or dealing in, the offset credits being evaluated? YES
- c) to address and isolate such conflicts, should they arise? YES

Summarize and provide evidence of the policies and procedures referred to in a) through c):

a) Section 7.2 of ISFL Validation and Verification Requirements (VVR) includes provisions to prevent/manage conflicts of interest of Validation and Verification Bodies conducting validation and verification processes.

c) & b) Section 7.2 of VVR include provisions that accredited VVBs contracted to conduct validation/verification of ER programs shall disclose their and their family member conflicts of interests pertaining to relationships with entity(ies) associated with ER transactions; and to identify and address conflicts that may arise during validation and verification of programs

Are procedures in place requiring that... (*Paragraph 3.3.4*)

a) the renewal of any activity at the end of its crediting period includes a reevaluation of its baselines, and procedures and assumptions for quantifying, monitoring, and verifying mitigation, including the baseline scenario? YES

b) the same procedures apply to activities that wish to undergo verification but have not done so within the programme's allowable number of years between verification events? YES

Summarize and provide evidence of the policies and procedures referred to in a) and b), including identifying the allowable number of years between verification events:

a) Item 12, Section 6 of Validation and Verification Requirements cover procedures relating to reevaluation of baseline at the start of a new crediting period.
b) Item 12, Section 6 procedures of Validation and Verification Requirements also apply to gaps in verification beyond the allowable gap in verification events.

Are procedures in place to transparently identify units that are issued *ex-ante* and thus ineligible for use in the CORSIA? (*Paragraph 3.3.5*) YES

Provide evidence of the policies and procedures referred to above:

Not Applicable. ISFL only issues ex-post certified ERs upon successful completion of verification events.

Question 4.4 Have a clear and transparent chain of custody

SECTION III, Part 3.4—Identification and tracking includes questions related to this criterion. No additional information is requested here.

Question 4.5 Represent permanent emissions reductions

List all emissions sectors (if possible, activity types) supported by the Programme that present a potential risk of reversal of emissions reductions, avoidance, or carbon sequestration:

Carbon sequestration activities in forestry, agriculture and other eligible land use categories and sub-categories referred in section 4.3 and Annex 1 of the ISFL ER Program Requirements are subject to potential risk of reversal.

What is the minimum scale of reversal for which the Programme provisions or measures require a response? (Quantify if possible)

Section 6 of the ISFL Buffer Requirements specify that ER programs must report on occurrence of any reversal. In case of occurrence of a reversal event, the reversals are expected to be compensated by buffer, which is calculated following each Reporting Period as a percentage of Total Net Emission Reductions for that Reporting Period minus the quantity of ERs allocated to the Uncertainty Buffer for that Reporting Period.

For sectors/activity types identified in the first question in this section, are procedures and measures in place to require and support these activities to...

- a) undertake a risk assessment that accounts for, *inter alia*, any potential causes, relative scale, and relative likelihood of reversals? (*Paragraph 3.5.2*) YES
- b) monitor identified risks of reversals? (*Paragraph 3.5.3*) YES
- c) mitigate identified risks of reversals? (*Paragraph 3.5.3*) YES
- d) ensure full compensation for material reversals of mitigation issued as emissions units toward offsetting obligations under the CORSIA? (*Paragraph 3.5.4*) YES

Summarize and provide evidence of the policies and procedures referred to in a) through d):

Section 4.7 of the ISFL ER Program Requirements specify provisions for accounting for reversals. Section 6, 7 and 10 of the ISFL Buffer Requirements cover establishment of buffer accounts, reversal risk assessment, monitoring and adjustment of buffer accounts in the events of reversal, and compensation of material reversals using Reversal Management Mechanism to meet the offsetting obligations under CORSIA.

- a) Section 7 of the ISFL Buffer Requirements specify a reversal risk assessment using a reversal risk assessment tool to assess reversal risk set aside percentage of a program using the Risk Factors listed in Table 2, Section 7 of the ISFL Buffer Guidelines. The reversal risk set aside percent in the form of a buffer could range between 10 percent and 40 percent of verified ERs depending on the level of reversal risk.
- b) ER programs are expected to monitor the risk factors listed in Table 2, Section 7 of the ISFL Buffer Requirements.
- c) Section 4.7 of the ISFL ER Program Requirements specify that programs should consider the identified risks in program design and implement interventions to mitigate their impact.
- d) Section 8 and 9 of the ISFL Buffer Requirements specify procedures for reversal management during the term of ISFL; and Section 10 of the ISFL Buffer Requirements clarify procedures for compensating material reversals beyond the term of the ISFL by transitioning to a CORSIA Eligible Emissions Unit Programme that administers comparable multi-decadal Programme elements and using the reversal management mechanism of CORSIA Eligible Emissions Unit Programme from the end of the term of the ISFL.

Are provisions in place that... (*Paragraph 3.5.5*)

- a) confer liability on the activity proponent to monitor, mitigate, and respond to reversals in a manner mandated in the programme procedures? YES
- b) require activity proponents, upon being made aware of a material reversal event, to notify the programme within a specified number of days? YES
- c) confer responsibility to the programme to, upon such notification, ensure and confirm that such reversals are fully compensated in a manner mandated in the programme procedures? YES

Summarize and provide evidence of the policies and procedures referred to in a) through c), including indicating the *number of days within which activity proponents must notify the programme of a material reversal event*:

a) & c) Section 4.7 of the ISFL ER Program Requirements; and Sections 6, 7, 8 and 10 of the ISFL Buffer Requirements present procedures for liability, monitoring, mitigation and compensation for material reversals.

b) Section 8.1 of the ISFL Buffer Requirements specify that programs shall inform a Reversal Event and identify the occurrence of a Reversal Event in its Reporting Period, within 90 calendar days after becoming aware of any Emissions in the Program Area or changes in ER Program circumstances that, in the reasonable opinion of the ER Program, may lead to Reversals of previously transferred ERs by the next Monitoring event.

Does the programme have the capability to ensure that any emissions units which compensate for the material reversal of mitigation issued as emissions units and used toward offsetting obligations under the CORSIA are fully eligible for use under the CORSIA? (*Paragraph 3.5.6*) YES

Summarize and provide evidence of the policies and procedures referred to above:

ER units in the reversal buffer are part of the ER program's verified ERs. Per Section 4.7 of the ISFL ER Program Requirements; and Sections 6, 7, 8 and 10 of the ISFL Buffer Requirements, reversal risk management policies and procedures of the ISFL can compensate material reversals during and beyond the ISFL term of 31 December 2030.

ER programs proposing to generate CORSIA eligible ERs beyond the term of ISFL (i.e. post-2030) are expected to transition to a CORSIA eligible Emissions Unit Programme at the end of 2030; and shall be continually managed and operated by a CORSIA Eligible Emissions Unit Programme, which administers comparable multi-decadal Programme elements in its scope of CORSIA eligibility and has in place a periodic monitoring and third-party Verification mechanism and ensure ER programs are capable of monitoring for and compensation for material reversals for a period of at least 15 years following the end of the crediting period beyond the term of ISFL in 2030 (i.e. 31 December 2045). These details are clarified in Section 10 of the ISFL Buffer Requirements and section 7.8 of the ISFL Process Requirements.

Would the programme be willing and able, upon request, to demonstrate that its permanence provisions can fully compensate for the reversal of mitigation issued as emissions units and used under the CORSIA? (*Paragraph 3.5.7*) YES

Question 4.6 Assess and mitigate against potential increase in emissions elsewhere

List all emissions sectors (if possible, activity types) supported by the programme that present a potential risk of material emissions leakage:

Agriculture, Forestry and other Land Use (AFOLU) activities supported through ISFL ER programs can have potential risk of leakage.

Are measures in place to assess and mitigate incidences of material leakage of emissions that may result from the implementation of an offset project or programme? (*Paragraph 3.6*) YES

Summarize and provide evidence of the policies and procedures referred to above:

Section 4.7 of the ISFL ER Program Requirements specify that ER programs should be designed to reduce risk of leakage, e.g., by maintaining the same level of production of commodities under ISFL ER programs that occurred prior to Programs, and by introducing and supporting alternative sustainable livelihoods in ER Programs to prevent and avoid the risk of leakage.

Are provisions in place requiring activities that pose a risk of leakage when implemented at the project-level to be implemented at a national level, or on an interim basis on a subnational level, in order to mitigate the risk of leakage? (*Paragraph 3.6.2*)

Summarize and provide evidence of the policies and procedures referred to above:

The ISFL ER Program Requirements requires programs to be designed and implemented at jurisdictional (sub-national/provincial/regional) scales, which are one level below national scale. The programs are expected to design and implement interventions to minimize potential leakage.

YES

Are procedures in place requiring and supporting activities to monitor identified leakage? (*Paragraph 3.6.3*)

Summarize and provide evidence of the policies and procedures referred to above:

Leakage is commonly associated with small projects (small fractions of jurisdictional programs) due to potential risk of shifts in their activities to areas outside project boundaries. However, large program jurisdictions significantly mitigate leakage risk as a range of program interventions that seek to maintain pre-program levels of production or economic activity within program jurisdiction avoid or minimize leakage risk. Therefore, jurisdictional programs by supporting policies and interventions at a landscape scale prevent, avoid and mitigate leakage risk.

Additionally, significant challenges exist for monitoring and attribution of displacement of leakage emissions of activities from large jurisdictional (sub-national/province/region) programs that span several million ha and cover a wide range of drivers, economic activities, land use categories and ecoregions. Hence, leakage from jurisdictional programs is not feasible to monitor in practice.

To ensure that leakage from ER program jurisdictions is not a risk, the ISFL ER Program Requirements specify that leakage mitigation measures should be mandatorily considered in the program design (Section 3.2.5); and are subject to assessment as part of verification to ensure the program design and intervention measures minimizes the risk of leakage.

The World Bank's Environmental and Social Framework (ESF) and safeguards requirements go beyond Cancun safeguards and ensure that measures to address leakage risk are in place as part of program design, monitoring and implementation of Environmental and Social Framework to actively address environmental risk associated with leakage or displacement of activities outside the boundaries of program jurisdiction.

YES

For these reasons, the ISFL ER Program Requirements consider that good program design is critical to addresses leakage/displacement risk as it is infeasible to attribute and estimate leakage associated with large sub-national ER programs.

YES

Are procedures in place requiring activities to deduct from their accounting emissions from any identified leakage that reduces the mitigation benefits of the activities? (*Paragraph 3.6.4*)

Summarize and provide evidence of the policies and procedures referred to above:

Per the ISFL ER Program Requirements, it is not feasible to attribute the leakage associated with sub-national programs. Therefore, no procedures for deduction of ERs for leakage have been approved in the ISFL ER Program Requirements.

Question 4.7 Are only counted once towards a mitigation obligation

Does the Programme have measures in place for the following:

- a) to ensure the transparent transfer of units between registries; and that only one unit is issued for one tonne of mitigation (*Paragraphs 3.7.1 and 3.7.5*) YES
- b) to ensure that one unit is issued or transferred to, or owned or cancelled by, only one entity at any given time? (*Paragraphs 3.7.2 and 3.7.6*) YES
- c) to discourage and prohibit the double-selling of units, which occurs when one or more entities sell the same unit more than once? (*Paragraph 3.7.7*) YES
- d) to require and demonstrate that host countries of emissions reduction activities agree to account for any offset units issued as a result of those activities such that double claiming does not occur between the airline and the host country of the emissions reduction activity? (*Paragraph 3.7.3*) YES

Summarize and provide evidence of the policies and procedures referred to in a) through d):

a & b) The ER Transaction Registry has capabilities to issue one unit for one tonne of mitigation and to transfer, retire/cancel by only one entity at a time to avoid double counting of ERs.

c & d) Section 3.7 of the ISFL ER Program Requirements specify that host countries implementing ER programs shall select an appropriate mechanism to avoid double counting, including double issuance, double selling/use, or double claiming, to track the ERs and ensure that any ERs that have been generated, monitored and verified under the ISFL ER Programs and paid for by the ISFL are not used again by any entity for sale, public relations, compliance or any other purpose. The ER Transaction Registry has capabilities to register, track, and as appropriate retire or cancel ER units generated under the ISFL ER program. The procedures are described in the Operational Guidelines for Emission Reductions Transaction Registry shared in a separate link and is confidential.

Additionally, paragraph 35, item (i) of Section 8.2 of the ISFL Validation and Verification Requirements, require Verification Bodies to assess the extent to which systems to avoid that ERs generated under the ISFL ER program have not been counted or compensated for more than once have been adequately implemented and confirm that issuance has not occurred in other known registries.

Does the Programme have procedures in place for the following: (*Paragraph 3.7.8*)

- a) to obtain, or require activity proponents to obtain and provide to the programme, written attestation from the host country's national focal point or focal point's designee? YES
- b) for the attestation(s) to specify, and describe any steps taken, to prevent mitigation associated with units used by operators under CORSIA from also being claimed toward a host country's national mitigation target(s) / pledge(s)? YES
- c) for Host country attestations to be obtained and made publicly available prior to the use of units from the host country in the CORSIA? YES

Summarize and provide evidence of the policies and procedures referred to in a) through c):

a) & b) Terms and Conditions of ER Transaction Registry; and Operational Guidelines of ER Transaction Registry documents will include provisions to address the above items.

Does the Programme have procedures in place requiring... (*Paragraph 3.7.9*)

a) that activities take approach(es) described in (any or all of) these sub-paragraphs to prevent double-claiming? YES

Emissions units are created where mitigation is not also counted toward national target(s) pledge(s) / mitigation contributions / mitigation commitments. (*Paragraph 3.7.9.1*)

Mitigation from emissions units used by operators under the CORSIA is appropriately accounted for by the host country when claiming achievement of its target(s) / pledges(s) / mitigation contributions / mitigation commitments, in line with the relevant and applicable international provisions. (*Paragraph 3.7.9.2*)

Programme procedures provide for the use of method(s) to avoid double-claiming which are not listed above (*Paragraph 3.7.9.3*)

b) that Host Country attestations confirm the use of approach(es) referred to in the list above? YES

Summarize and provide evidence of the policies and procedures referred to in a) and b):

a) & b) Terms and Conditions of ER Transaction Registry; and Operational Requirements of ER Transaction Registry documents will include provisions to address the above items.

Does the Programme... (*Paragraph 3.7.10*)

a) make publicly available any national government decisions related to accounting for units used in ICAO, including the contents of host country attestations described in paragraph 3.7.8? YES

b) update information pertaining to host country attestation as often as necessary to avoid double-claiming. YES

Summarize and provide evidence of the policies and procedures referred to in a) and b):

a) & b) Terms and Conditions of ER Transaction Registry; and Operational Requirements of ER Transaction Registry documents will include provisions to address the above items.

YES

Does the Programme have procedures in place to compare countries' accounting for emissions units in national emissions reports against the volumes of eligible units issued by the programme and used under the CORSIA which the host country's national reporting focal point or designee otherwise attested to its intention to not double-claim? (*Paragraph 3.7.11*)

Summarize and provide evidence of the policies and procedures referred to above:

The Terms and Conditions of ER Transaction Registry; and Operational Requirements of the ER Transaction Registry will include provisions to address the above items.

YES

Does the Programme have procedures in place for the programme, or proponents of the activities it supports, to compensate for, replace, or otherwise reconcile double-claimed mitigation associated with units used under the CORSIA which the host country's national accounting focal point or designee otherwise attested to its intention to not double-claim? (*Paragraph 3.7.13*)

Summarize and provide evidence of the policies and procedures referred to above:

The Terms and Conditions of ER Transaction Registry; and Operational Requirements of the ER Transaction Registry will include provisions to address the above items.

YES

Would the Programme be willing and able, upon request, to report to ICAO's relevant bodies, as requested, performance information related to, *inter alia*, any material instances of and programme responses to country-level double-claiming; the nature of, and any changes to, the number, scale, and/or scope of host country attestations; any relevant changes to related programme measures? (*Paragraph 3.7.12*)

Question 4.8 Do no net harm

Are procedures in place to ensure that offset projects do not violate local, state/provincial, national or international regulations or obligations? (*Paragraph 3.8*) YES

Summarize and provide evidence of the policies and procedures referred to above:

Section 3.1.4 of the ISFL ER Program Document Template requires that programs should include information on planned actions and interventions comply local, regional and national laws, statutes and regulatory frameworks, including relevant international conventions and agreements. The programs also expected to identify legal and regulatory gaps and clarify how they will be addressed.

Describe, and provide evidence that demonstrates, how the programme complies with social and environmental safeguards: (*Paragraph 3.8*)

ISFL programs are required to comply with the World Bank's Environmental and Social Framework (ESF) and are required to report on their compliance with ESF requirements and monitor their implementation. To address grievances of stakeholders, ER programs are required to operationalize an FGRM to address grievances in relation to the program compliance with ESF. Additional information details on compliance with social and environmental safeguards is presented in response to the question 3.9 above.

Describe, and provide evidence of the programme's public disclosure of, the institutions, processes, and procedures that are used to implement, monitor, and enforce safeguards to identify, assess and manage environmental and social risks: (*Paragraph 3.8*)

The ISFL follows the requirements of World Bank Policy on Access to Information on public disclosure of safeguards documentation and disclosure of documents relating to environmental and social risks prior to appraisal. The information on institutions with accountability, processes, procedures to be followed, objectives and contents of documents, their rationale, arrangements for implementation are clarified in the Environmental and Social Framework and Safeguards Plan prepared to identify, monitor, manage and enforce safeguards relating to environmental and social risks for compliance with World Bank's environmental and social framework (ESF) over a specified timeframe and based on consultations with relevant stakeholder.

Section F of the Environmental and Social Policy for Investment project Financing of the World Bank Environmental and Social Framework clarifies the provisions of information disclosure and can be referred at the below link.

<http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/837721522762050108/Environmental-and-Social-Framework.pdf>

The World Bank Policy on Access to Information is available at the below link.

<http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/393051435850102801/World-Bank-Policy-on-Access-to-Information-V2.pdf>

PART 5: Programme comments

Are there any additional comments the programme wishes to make to support the information provided in this form?

No

SECTION IV: SIGNATURE

I certify that I am the administrator or authorized representative (“Programme Representative”) of the emissions unit programme (“Programme”) represented in a) this form, b) evidence accompanying this form, and c) any subsequent oral and/or written correspondence (a-c: “Programme Submission”) between the Programme and ICAO; and that I am duly authorized to represent the Programme in all matters related to ICAO’s analysis of this application form; and that ICAO will be promptly informed of any changes to the contact person(s) or contact information listed in this form.

As the Programme Representative, I certify that all information in this form is true, accurate, and complete to the best of my knowledge.

As the Programme Representative, I acknowledge that:

the Programme’s participation in the assessment does not guarantee, equate to, or prejudice future decisions by Council regarding CORSIA-eligible emissions units; and

the ICAO is not responsible for and shall not be liable for any losses, damages, liabilities, or expenses that the Programme may incur arising from or associated with its voluntary participation in the assessment; and

as a condition of participating in the assessment, the Programme will not at any point publicly disseminate, communicate, or otherwise disclose the nature, content, or status of communications between the Programme and ICAO, and of the assessment process generally, unless the Programme has received prior notice from the ICAO Secretariat that such information has been and/or can be publicly disclosed.

Signed:

Roy Parizat

April 20, 2020

Full name of Programme Representative (*Print*)

Date signed (*Print*)



Programme Representative (*Signature*)

(This signature page may be printed, signed, scanned and submitted as a separate file attachment)



ICAO

Programme Application Form, Appendix B

Programme Assessment Scope

CONTENTS: With this document, programmes may define which of their activities they are submitting for assessment by the TAB. The two sheets are described below:

- Sheet A) Activities the programme describes in this form, which will be assessed by ICAO's T.
- Sheet B) List of all methodologies / protocols that support activities described under Sheet A

AB

