

Restoring the degraded watershed and livelihoods of Lakhandei river basin through Sustainable Land Management

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10469

Countries

Nepal

Project Name

Restoring the degraded watershed and livelihoods of Lakhandei river basin through Sustainable Land Management

Agencies

IUCN

Date received by PM

5/3/2021

Review completed by PM

6/2/2021

Program Manager

Ulrich Apel

Focal Area

Land Degradation

Project Type

MSP

PIF ☐

CEO Endorsement ☐

Part I ? Project Information**Focal area elements**

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2021: Yes.

However, it is noted that amounts requested in Table A are lower than at PIF stage.
Please clarify if that is intended.

06/02/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

We duly realised this difference. In fact, at the time of PIF preparation, the component-wise budget was estimated tentatively as the detailed activities were not yet identified. In the funding proposal stage, detailed activities to contribute to achieve the outcomes were identified and budgets estimated. When all activity costs were estimated, the total was a bit smaller which the team considered okay to submit. But with the GEF

secretariat note, we realised that this could be adjusted and thus have adjusted. Hence, we adjusted the difference in the relevant sections of the updated project document such as in Section 1.10 (project summary), Section 8 (project budget), Table 26,27,28 (see grand total of revised budget, Annex 9, as attached) and corrected everywhere accordingly. This adjustment has been reflected in Section A, B, C and D of the GEF CEO endorsement request as well.

On the whole, the value of GEF Project financing is \$ 1,555,505 which was the same amount in the PIF as well.

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response
GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2021: Not fully.

1) Table D may need to be adjusted (depending on response to comment on Table A)

2) Comments on the project budget:

- The project budget is not presented in the required GEF budget template as per GEF project cycle guidelines. The GEF budget table needs to be completed, uploaded in the documents sections and the same table inserted in Annex E in the portal.

- As presented the reviewer cannot fully assess the budget. From the budget presented in the Agency Prodoc, there are several issues, not limited to the following:

(i) different totals for PMC in Prodoc and in Portal table A.

(ii) ineligible items included in PMC (motorcycles). For inclusion in project component budget it would be required to justify the purchase of motor vehicles, including why they can't be purchased by co-financing.

(iii) M&E budget is currently included in the PMC budget, in the GEF budget template this needs to be separate.

(iv) What is included in the budget line for construction costs?

06/02/2021: Not fully addressed.

(i) The budget incorporated in portal, as Annex E, is not the same as the uploaded Excel table. As per paragraph 2 ? page 42 of the Guidelines, *?The Budget Template in Appendix A should be completed by the Agency and submitted at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval as an annex in the Portal. ?The same Budget Template in excel format should be uploaded in the Portal - section ?Documents?.* Please insert in Annex E the same budget table they have uploaded as an excel document.

(ii) the PMC has three different values: two in the attached Budget (\$105,896 and \$141,091), another in Table B (\$139,414). Please keep the same amount across the different budgets.

06/17/2021: Reviewer can't locate the budget table in Annex E of the portal template. Annex E is empty, please double check.

06/21/2021: Budget table inserted in Annex E.

Cleared

Agency Response

1) Changes in the budget has been adjusted and corrected accordingly everywhere.

The value of GEF financing in Table D is equal to value of GEF financing in Table A which is \$1,555,505.

2) Following GEF budget template, updated project budget is prepared and presented (see Annex 9, revised project budget attached). The budget table are completed, uploaded in the documents and inserted in Annex E in the portal.

We would like to further clarify that the secretariat's note has been duly acknowledged. The first sheet in Annex 9 is a GEF format where we have presented the budget that we prepared. However, for easy review of the detail on how has that budget been derived/estimated, we have added several sheets. The value in the GEF budget template (first sheet) are then linked to the value in the respective sheet where we have detail estimation. This clarifies as how has that budget figure in budget sheet has been estimated.

(i) These are now corrected in the portal as per the Prodoc. **The corrected figure is USD 105,896** (GEF Project Financing) + USD 478,326 (co financing) = USD 582,222

(ii) Cost of motorcycles has been removed (see budget summary and details. (Annex 9 attached).

In our original presentation, we included the cost of motorcycle for easing the travel of project staff and resource persons to travel to the project sites where four-wheelers cannot go. There are several activities such as development of a simple and participatory land degradation monitoring system which needs identifying exact site, consultation with communities, designing system, testing the system, updating the system, etc. at the municipality level This cost has been now removed from PMC and adjusted under the activity dedicated to provide such services (Activity 1.1.1). This is in fact a travel cost for the service of a motorcycle.

(iii) We have duly considered this suggestion and separated the regular monitoring budget (\$2,087) from PMC and have included under M&E in column H (see revised Annex 9 project budget attached).

(iv) Construction costs include construction of various structures as follows:

- Establishment of demonstration plots of best practices on watershed restoration (Activity 2.2.2)
- Establishment of nursery structures (forest/horticulture) and Seedling distribution (Lalbandi-3 & Marin-1) (Activity 2.3.3)
- Establishment of riverbanks in degraded forest land (3 Lalbandi & 1 Marin) (Activity 2.3.4.2)
- Rehabilitation of flood affected farmland (5000 HA) (Activity 2.3.5.2)
- Construction for the protection, conservation and maintenance of small irrigation systems (Activity 2.3.5.3)
- Bio-engineering, check dams (Activity 2.3.5.4)
- Construction and maintenance of conservation ponds and protection, conservation and/or maintenance of drinking water sources along the LRB (Activity 2.3.6)
- Establishment of local product based market places, at Lalbandi and Sindhuli in collaboration with local municipalities (Activity 3.3.2.1)

- Creating decentralized market places such as collection and primary processing centres for NTPFs, community facility centres for fruit and vegetables, seeds, NTFPs and other locally produced market based SLM products (Activity 3.3.3.1)

These are clarified in the detailed budget estimation in Annex 9 Sheet named "Details(Activities Wise)"

15/06/2021

(i) Kindly note that now we have now made sure that the budgets in the ProDoc and the portal are harmonised. Uploaded Budget *Excel budget sheet in the Annex E of the CEO Endorsement Template*

(ii) Kindly note that the PMC budgets have been reconciled. The one in the CEO endorsement template has two rows, one for general PMC and the other for the M&E PMC budget that adds upto the aggregate PMC cost of USD 139, 414. There is no other way of reflecting the M&E budget separate from PMC in the GEF portal CEO endorsement form.

21/06/2021

We have now included the updated budget table by project component in Annex E of the CEO endorsement template

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2021: Clarification question:

The CCM-target under core indicator 6.1 has been based on a 5 year accounting period. As per GEF monitoring guidelines, AFOLU projects should use a 20 years accounting period unless there is justification for a shorter accounting period. Please clarify why a shorter accounting period of 5 years has been selected.

06/02/2021: Additional comment:

The of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment in Annex A Results Framework, does not match the number expected at CEO endorsement listed in Core Indicator Worksheet. Please double check and adjust as necessary.

06/17/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

We have recognised this fact. The CCM-target is calculated based on 20 years accounting period. See Table 1 of the updated Prodoc as well as in the CEO endorsement template where we have specified as " Average removal 38245.16 (20 years accounting rate, tCO₂e/ha/year) and corrected the accounting period to 20 years

15/06/2021

This is now corrected and the breakdown provided is the same as the one provided in the PIF for the CEO endorsement stage.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2021: Not fully

The context section is lacking any consideration of COVID-19 situation, risks and opportunities, both in the GEF portal template and in the Agency Prodoc. Please address.

06/02/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

A sub-section on COVID 19 situation and its response is included in the Context Section (3.1 Background and Context) of the updated project document.

We did analyse the COVID-19 pandemic risk also while preparing the project. One important thing we would like to highlight is that the COVID-19 pandemic risk was of medium level that time and the team included it as follows.

Impact of COVID-19 pandemic may further increase poverty and deprivation of community	Medium	At the time of project design, impact of COVID-19 on project area is not specifically known, though some of the potential impacts consist of increased cases of illegal collection of forest products and pressure on natural resources as a result of job loss in other sectors. The project will carry out a brief assessment of the impact of COVID-19 in the project area during first year and collaborate with province and local governments to generate employment through value chain development.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

However, the COVID-19 pandemic risk has rapidly increased in Nepal these days. In this regard, we fully agree with the comments and have revised it in the current context. At this time, COVID-19 pandemic has been rated as a major risk by the team. We have added a separate Sub-section 3.1.4.

In the risk analysis Table 21, we have revised it as follows.

<p>COVID 19 pandemic will be out of control hampering the implementation of the project.</p> <p>(The COVID-19 pandemic is having far reaching impacts, well beyond the health sector, with the most severe impacts experienced among vulnerable and marginalized communities who are typically hardest affected by humanitarian crises, including natural disasters. This has caused significant risk to people's access to essential services, food, and resilient livelihoods, especially for informal sector workers and vulnerable groups who may be suddenly and more adversely impacted).</p>	Major	<p>The project will work strictly following the COVID protocol and guidelines of the government.</p> <p>The project will work in coordination with the Humanitarian Country Team under the joint leadership of the UN Resident Coordinator and WHO, federal, provincial, and local governments as well as local communities to response the COVID 19 situation as guided by the COVID 19 Nepal: Preparedness and Response Plan (CPRP) prepared by the Humanitarian Country Team and the clusters working in collaboration with, and support to, the Government of Nepal.</p> <p>The project will develop a mechanism to provide right, and authentic scientific information related to the COVID 19. to the local communities in the project area.</p> <p>If COVID 19 does not get under control, which is severe at present in all over Nepal, there is a risk that start of the project might need to be delayed by few months (or even one year in worst case scenario). In such a case planned activities need to be re-arranged and implemented flexibly as deemed necessary.</p> <p>On the other hand, the project will also have an opportunity to work with the local people to help them to some extent in this difficult situation. Proposed activities will help communities strengthen local food supply chains and sustainable production by providing necessary inputs, technical assistance, capacity development and diversification opportunities. It will support community engagement in different activities related to the restoration of the degraded land including tree plantations offering alternative income while promoting environmental protection.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

A narrative on COVID-19 pandemic is presented in Sub-section 3.1.4 at the end of the subsection 3.1 3.and before 3.2 Global Environment Problem of the updated project document. It follows-

3.1.4 COVID 19 situation and its response

The COVID-19 pandemic is having far reaching impacts, well beyond the health sector, with the most severe impacts experienced among vulnerable and marginalized communities who are typically hardest affected by humanitarian crises, including natural disasters. This has caused significant risk to people's access to essential services, food, and resilient livelihoods, especially for informal sector workers and vulnerable groups who may be suddenly and more adversely impacted.

If COVID 19 does not get under control, which is severe at present in all over Nepal, there is a risk that start of the project might need to be delayed by few months (more even one year in worst case scenario). In such a case planned activities need to be re-arranged and implemented flexibly as deemed necessary.

On the other hand, the project will also have an opportunity to work with the local people to help them to some extent in this difficult situation. Proposed activities will help communities strengthen local food supply chains and sustainable production by providing necessary inputs, technical assistance, capacity development and diversification opportunities. It will support community engagement in different activities related to the restoration of the degraded land including tree plantations offering alternative income while promoting environmental protection.

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/14/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

n/a

Agency Response

Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2021: Yes.

06/02/2021: ADDITIONAL comment:

A stakeholder engagement plan has been developed and it indicates that CSOs and IPs have been consulted and there are plans for further consultation given the limited level of consultations due to COVID, therefore, please tick the 'consulted' box in the Portal submission.

06/17/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

15/06/2021

Done as advised

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2021: No.

The main question on whether a gender analysis has been completed and/or documented is not being addressed by the submission. Reviewer could also not find adequate information on gender in the Prodoc and no additional documentation was uploaded in the documents section.

06/02/2021: Partly addressed.

Gender analysis and gender action plan were uploaded. However there is no information on these two document in the portal submission. Please provide brief summary and make reference to these two documents in the portal template text.

06/17/2021: Addressed as per agency response below and in the portal.

Cleared

Agency Response

We did gender analysis, however the analytical report was missing in the earlier submission, this report is now submitted (see updated Annex 13a-);

- Addressed in the updated pro-doc section 3.1.2.10 (Page 25) and (both actions and budget); And have developed a separate Gender-IP Action Plan with budget also (Annex 13b of project document)

15/06/2021

As per the suggestion the two paragraphs **are** added to the section 3 Gender and Woman Empowerment in the CEO endorsement Template.

?Gender analysis at the LRB has been carried out. The majority of the households are indigenous, Dalits, and disadvantaged people. The literacy rate of women is lower than men. Women are inadequately involved in programme planning, implementation, and monitoring. Women, IPs, and disadvantaged people are engaged in subsistence agriculture, livestock and forestry activities and have limited access to resources, credit facilities, economic opportunities, information to climate-resilient technology,

agriculture inputs. Although municipalities have started allocating budget for income generation for women, it is inadequate and confined to skill-oriented training. Key issues and challenges faced by women, indigenous people and Dalits were identified in the LRB (Annex 13a. Gender Analysis Report)?

?All the project outcome and output areas will be reinforced by gender and IPs specific activities ensuring their issues are duly answered (Annex 13b IPs and GESI Action Plan). Women and women?s groups will be actively engaged by the project to ensure their proactive role in livelihood opportunities and to strengthen their capacity to participate confidently in project activities?. Please refer to Annex 13b IPs and GESI Action Plan.

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2021: Not adequately.

The risk table presents a mixture of "challenges", which are not major risks, and risks that are not well assessed and their mitigation measures are very generic. Please address by assessing major risks comprehensively and identify adequate mitigation measures, in particular for climate change and extreme climate events, and for COVID-19.

06/02/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

As mentioned in response to question 1 under Part 2 above, Section 4.4 Risk analysis and risk management measures has been improved taking into account current country situation and their mitigation measures are suggested. (please see changes in Table 21, Section 4.4 of the project document.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2021: Not fully.

Please insert a grand total line in the M&E budget table so that the reviewer can easily compare the totals figure with the figure to be presented in the GEF budget template.

06/02/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

As suggested, M&E budget column (Column H in first sheet Budget summary) is inserted in the revised budget sheet (see revised budget, Annex 9 attached).

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2021: Correction Request

Please upload the next version of the Agency Project Document as "public", so that it can be posted on our website once the project has been approved.

06/02/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response Kindly note that initially we made a mistake by uploading the first one as GEF Secretariat view only and hence the most updated version uploaded now is "public", which is also renamed Public

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
05/14/2021: Comments at PIF stage have been taken into account.

Cleared

Agency Response
Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a for MSP

Agency Response
STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a for MSP

Agency Response
Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
05/14/2021: Accurately presented.

Cleared

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
05/14/2021: Are available.

Cleared

Agency Response
Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

n/a

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response
Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
05/14/2021: No. Please address comments made in this review.

06/02/2021: No. Please address comments made in this review.

06/17/2021: No. Reviewer cannot locate budget table in Annex E. Please check.

06/21/2021: Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO approval.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	5/14/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/2/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/17/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/21/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The project is fully in line with the objectives of the LDFA. It is requesting GEF assistance to achieve the long term solution of addressing Lakhadei watershed degradation in Sarlahi district of Province 2 and its users of Sindhuli district of Province 3 of Nepal. The project is expected to result in key modifications to the baseline scenario that will lead to the generation of global environmental benefits through sustainable land management and will contribute in the achievement of national land degradation neutrality targets set under the UNCCD. As stated in the Final Report of the Land Degradation Neutrality Target Setting Programme in Nepal (2018), the Lakhadei is a priority watershed in the country and hence the project is fully in line with the national priorities.

The project objective is to strengthen institutions and mechanisms to accelerate progress in the achievement of land degradation neutrality in Nepal. The benefits will also be generated through piloting and scaling of SLM options in productive landscapes to deliver on ecosystems benefits to both livelihoods and biodiversity. The global

environment benefits that project will contribute are; improved provision of agro-ecosystem and forest ecosystem goods and services; mitigated/avoided greenhouse gas emissions and increased carbon sequestration in production landscapes; conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in productive landscapes; and reduced pollution and siltation of international waters. Specific core indicator targets that have been set are: 8,500 ha under restoration (indicator 3), 4,300 ha under SLM to benefits biodiversity (4.1), and 38,000 t of CO₂eq (6.1); the project will reach approximately 68,000 beneficiaries.

The project will work strictly following the COVID protocol and guidelines of the government. It will work in coordination with the Humanitarian Country Team under the joint leadership of the UN Resident Coordinator and WHO, federal, provincial, and local governments as well as local communities to response the COVID 19 situation as guided by the COVID 19 Nepal: Preparedness and Response Plan (CPRP) prepared by the Humanitarian Country Team and the clusters working in collaboration with, and support to, the Government of Nepal. It is noted that the risk of COVID-19 in Nepal remains at a medium level.