



Enhancing capacity for sustainable management of forests, land and biodiversity in the Eastern Hills (ECSM FoLaBi EH)

Basic Information

GEF ID

10381

Countries

Nepal

Project Title

Enhancing capacity for sustainable management of forests, land and biodiversity in the Eastern Hills (ECSM FoLaBi EH)

GEF Agency(ies)

FAO

Agency ID

FAO: 666821

GEF Focal Area(s)

Multi Focal Area

Program Manager

Hannah Fairbank

PIF

Part I – Project Informatics

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 22, 2019 HF: Project scope fits within the BD 1-1 entry point (mainstreaming), but please reallocate the BD resources away from 1-5 entry point as Inclusive Conservation has a dedicated/stand alone project of which this PIF is not a part.

UA:

While there is correct alignment with objective LD-1-3 for forest landscape restoration in Table A, the project lacks alignment with the UNCCD agenda, notably the LDN concept and the intended contribution of the project to achieve voluntary targets, if Nepal has set them.

Further, the work on restoration with a significant area to be restored would most likely result in carbon benefits, please clarify why Rio Marker for CC-M is "zero" and why no carbon benefits targets are estimated for the project, or please indicate a Rio Marker for CC-M.

October 31, 2019 HF: All comments cleared.

Agency Response

1. 1. Alignment to BD1-5 has been deleted, and all biodiversity resources allocated to BD 1-1.
2. 2. The concept of LDN and LD has been incorporated in the PIF
3. 3. CCM co benefit estimates have been added to core indicator 6 and Rio Marker for CCM has been updated. It is currently estimated at 3 million tCO₂Eq for 20-year duration, starting from 2021.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion October 22, 2019 HF: Yes.

Agency Response

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 22, 2019 HF: Please describe how "investment mobilized" was defined for purposes of identifying a co-finance amount for this project from the government. Please describe how the estimate for FAO's co-financing amount was estimated given the type is "unknown at this stage."

October 31, 2019 HF: All comments cleared.

Agency Response

The investment mobilized are considered, as per GEF definition, not recurrent expenditures. Both Government and FAO investment mobilized will be new capital investment.

The government cofinance is being considered from a 40 million dollars Green Climate Fund project that has been developed and is under negotiation with the GCF for funding by the government and FAO. This project is focused Churia region of Province 1 (the same Province, where this GEF project will also work). The CGF project landscape is continuous landscape between GEF project and the Terai region. Both projects will be supporting Provincial government capacities building on natural resources management.

· FAO co-finance has been clarified. The FAO investment mobilized is expected to grant received from be its regional and HQ resources for targeted new technical cooperation programme related to this project and new donor funding.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion October 22, 2019 HF: Yes. Agency fee looks to be about 8.6%, within GEF guidelines.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion October 22, 2019 HF: Yes. Sufficient STAR exists for this project.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 22, 2019 HF: Yes. As the full STAR allocation remains across all Focal Areas for GEF-7 Nepal (BD \$3.75m, LD \$1.5m, CCM \$4.36 with marginal adjustment of \$2m), there may or may not be a need to use the marginal adjustment to support LD just yet (as indicated in the LOE below), but regardless, at this point there is sufficient STAR (and marginal adjustment across Focal Areas) to support this project.

The total financing (from GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF) being requested for this project is US\$ 4,750,000 inclusive of project preparation grant (PPG), and Agency fees for project cycle management services associated with the total GEF grant. The financing requested for Nepal is detailed in the table below. Marginal flexibility provision is being exercised (moving \$1,000,000 from the CCM focal area and \$358,500 from BD focal area to support LD focal area priorities).

| Source of Funds | GEF Agency | Focal Area | Amount (in US\$) | | | |
|----------------------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------|---------|-----------|
| | | | Project Preparation | Project | Fee | Total |
| GEF TF | FAO | BD | 107,100 | 2,990,160 | 294,240 | 3,391,500 |
| GEF TF | FAO | LD | 42,900 | 1,197,739 | 117,861 | 1,358,500 |
| Total GEF Resources | | | 150,000 | 4,187,900 | 412,100 | 4,750,000 |

Agency Response Project resource allocation has been readjusted as per OFP endorsement letter.

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion October 22, 2019 HF: Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 22, 2019 HF:

It looks like only 10% of the total target hectares are “to benefit biodiversity” (indicator 4.1) whereas more than half the total resources are BD resources. Given this we would expect the target for hectares with biodiversity benefits would be commensurate with the BD focal area funding allocation for the project. Sub-indicators 4.1, 4.2, 4.4 are where BD GEBs should be targeted/captured. Quantity of targeted hectares for indicators 4.3 and 3.2 should likewise be commensurate with LD resources. Please adjust, correct, explain.

UA: Please confirm that targets have been selected in line with guideline (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.02) especially with regard that in GEF-7 only direct targets are monitored (except for carbon). Please also include a target for core indicator 6.

October 31, 2019 HF: All comments cleared.

Agency Response

In line with GEF's guidance on direct project impacts, the indicators 4.1 are considered *to be direct* impacts of working with 200+ community forests in the proposed landscapes. The initially indicated figure (which has now been corrected) was for the entire landscape. The figures for 4.2 and 4.4 have also been added, and figures for 3.2 has been adjusted. The targets are mutually exclusive.

Core Indicator 6 has been included.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion October 22, 2019 HF: Yes. Please see previous comment on Rio Marker for CC-M though.

Agency Response Rio Marker for CCM has been corrected to 1 from 0.

art II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019 HF: Yes. Please correct typo/missing row in first paragraph of Context section. It currently reads: “and serve critical connecting landscape between and are in and of themselves vital and diverse ecosystems”

October 31, 2019 HF: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

This has been corrected.

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019 HF: Surprised not to see WWF Nepal's baseline projects in the target geographies given their robust history of engagement with community forestry and protected areas, in particular in Kanchenjunga CA and beyond. Please ensure to include a more complete assessment of associated baseline projects includes ongoing and previous organizations, and projects, including WWF Nepal's in the project geographies as this will be critical in assuring the GEF increment, need for this investment and robust coordination of activities on the ground.

October 31, 2019 HF: All comments cleared.

Agency Response

WWF's baseline work on Eastern Himalayas and Terai Arc Landscape has been included under baseline section. Further work on other baseline will be detailed during full project proposal stage.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019 HF:

1.) Output 1.1 Target: At least one policy and planning framework developed for Province 1, to be tested in project area What type of “policy and planning framework”? Similar to the landscape management plan for TAL? And wouldn’t the implementation of framework in project area (rather than “tested”) be possible in a 48 month period?

2.) Outcome 3.3, indicative activities need more explanation please.

3.) Output 3.4: a.) Please explain what is meant by “pro-poor” in this context; b.) please articulate TOC linking livelihood activities and BD impacts, including whether/how this project intends to take an “evidence-based approach” to the design of these livelihoods/enterprises by using the wealth of experience/evidence on ‘conservation enterprises’ and learning from extensive past failures. One useful resource on this is: https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/pa00n41k.pdf Checklist starting on pg 21 is particularly user friendly.

4.) Output 3.5: what are examples of criteria to determine ‘feasibility’ of livelihood activities?

October 31, 2019: Comments cleared but as previously requested (in 3. b. above) please focus during PPG on clearly articulating a Theory Of Change, and design of enterprise/livelihood activities that draw from the evidence-base and lessons learned in this field and will result in desired and concrete biodiversity conservation outcomes.

Agency Response

1) Yes, the policy and planning framework will be similar to TAL’s management plan. The project will implement the framework and the Output has been amended as suggested. **Output 1.1.: A policy and planning framework for landscape level biodiversity-sensitive land use and forest management implemented by Province One and 34 Municipalities, including LDN targets for the Province 1**

2) The Output 3.3 is now **Output 3.3:** At least ten (10) community-based anti-poaching and fire control networks established to protect ecosystem services and conserve globally threatened species such as the Red Panda and highly exploited floral species . It includes the text “Work of anti-poaching units of local communities, for example also reduce threats to some globally threatened species such as Cheer Pheasant (*Catreus wallichii*) VU; Hog Deer (Endangered); Red Panda (Endangered); Critically Endangered Chinese Pangolin. In addition, they will also ensure that and highly exploited floral species, such as *Taxus wallichiana*, *Juglans regia*, *Rubia Majith*, *Swertia chirata*, *Danphe bholuwa* etc are conserved.. Many of high value forests are also impacted by fire seasonally. Therefore, the project will support anti-wildlife poaching work by local communities in some identified hotspots, such as near protected areas”

3. Outputs 3.4 and 3.5 are linked. Whilst Output 3.4 focuses on market based incentives for better management private lands – geared towards more sustainable land management; the focus of 3.5 is on community forests and on incentivizing effective management of community forests for biodiversity conservation. Under 3.4, the “pro-poor” is considered from the perspective of the fact that richer households are migrating to cities and or abroad, with agricultural lands being left fallow. This leads to land degradation through non-maintenance of terraces or infestation of weeds and other invasive plants on such lands. By developing mechanisms whereby poorer households (including women, who are often left behind in villages) can lease and benefit from sustainable use of such lands. This has been added in the Output 3.4.
4. 3.5 has been distinguished from 3.4 as explained earlier.

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019 HF:

Please see Part I #1 above, in addition if any protected areas work will be done that could be included as an entry point.

UA: not fully aligned with LD strategy with regard to LDN concept. Please clarify what are the targets of Nepal for LDN, do provincial targets exist, and what is the project's intended contribution to implement the LDN targets?

October 31, 2019 HF: All comments cleared.

Agency Response

The project will primarily work outside protected areas but protected areas will be considered a part of landscape level plan under Output 1.1, similar to Terai Arc Plan. In addition, work along the protected areas to mitigate poaching and illegal tree harvest are also envisaged to help maintain high value forests, as reported under indicator 4.4.

LDN targets for Nepal has been included, please see Alignment to GEF-7 Focal area and Impact Program strategies and Consistency with National Priorities

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019 HF: Yes. This is an excellent opportunity to mainstream biodiversity into land-use planning in the new provincial and local structures in an area of Nepal that is important from a global perspective and in-need of the incremental GEF investment.

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019 HF: In the section of the PIF titled "Global Environmental Benefits" please clearly articulate the GEBs for BD and LD that are expected via this investment. The section currently talks about the project interventions, rather than the expected benefits/outcomes/impacts for global biodiversity conservation and LD(N).

Please see requested correction/clarifications in #6 above under Core Indicators.

October 31, 2019 HF: All comments cleared.

Agency Response

GEBs related to BD and LD have been added as:

The direct global biodiversity benefits from this project will be realized through mainstreaming biodiversity conservation priorities within CFUG's management of their forests and other natural resources in a highly biodiverse area of Nepal. This will include at least 40,000 ha of CF lands with plans that incorporate better monitoring and incorporate management objectives on biodiversity conservation – particularly globally important species – such as birds and mammals. Work of anti-poaching units of local communities, for example also reduce threats to some globally threatened species such as Cheer Pheasant (*Catreus wallichii*) VU; Hog Deer (Endangered); Red Panda (Endangered); Critically Endangered Chinese Pangolin The project's work will also ensure reduced pressures on high conservation value forests in protected areas that lie within the region – such as the Kanchenjunga Conservation Area. In terms of land degradation benefits,

the project will ensure restoration of at least 25000 ha of degraded community forest areas, mostly through assisted natural regeneration as well effective soil and water management on private land within priority geographic hotspots equalling around 15000 ha. In addition, through landscape level planning and incorporation of LDN targets, the project will also influence wider area of over 700,000 ha in Province 1 and will also have CCM co-benefits.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019 HF: Several outcomes under Component 1 are dependent on significant capacity building. Please share how sustainability of capacity building impacts will be addressed under the project.

Please see question below regarding sustainability of KM database/activities.

October 31, 2019 HF: All comments cleared.

Agency Response

- a. The following has been added to the Sustainability and Potential for Scaling Up section

The capacity building and KMIS systems will be institutionalized at the Federal level with the Forest Research and Training Centre (FRTC) in the MOFE and its institutionalization in Province 1 forest Research and Training Centre will also be explored at PPG stage.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019 HF: A map has been included in Annex A.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019 HF: The concept provided a table which explained the functions of each of the main project stakeholders, but is lacking information about the stakeholder engagement to date and proposed means of future stakeholder engagement.

Please include a description of stakeholder engagement in this project concept to date-what has happened up to this point in term of stakeholder engagement? (or provide explanatory justification). Please include information about proposed means of future stakeholder engagement (how?).

October 31, 2019 HF: All comments cleared.

Agency Response

During PIF preparation, several government and non-governmental organizations were consulted. In particular, MOFE and Forest Research and Training Centre were the key government stakeholders involved in the design of the PIF. Others consulted include FECOFUN, IUCN, and the Bird Conservation Nepal. In addition, Provincial government and key local level CSOs involved in community forestry were also consulted – such as local FECOFUN chapter. Strong stakeholder involvement will be ensured during full project proposal development, as well as during full project implementation. A technical working committee composed of government, and key national level programmes/ CSOs will be instituted to support and guide the full project development at the Federal level. This will meet regularly and provide policy guidance, ensure cross sectoral support and undertake formal reviews of different versions of project document. In addition, key stakeholders at Provincial level will also be involved through regular meetings. Several consultation workshops are envisaged during project design stage at national, Provincial and local levels. For selected project sites, the project will ensure strong consultations with women, youths and other marginalized groups through focus group consultations; as well as ensure Free Prior Informed Consent. Stakeholders will be informed of formal Grievance Mechanism as well. Sample household surveys may also be conducted to establish baseline for the project.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019 HF: Given the changing demographic and the importance of gender issues described early in the PIF, to what extent will assessment be necessary to understand and integrate gender issues into project design during the PPG phase? How does the project intend to address this?

Why is the target for women represented in consultations or workshops set at 40%?

What safeguards (or mitigation measures) will be put in place to address the issue of in equal distribution of burden and participation of women in projects/CFUGs etc given women do much of the work associated with the home, children and in some cases farming and enterprise?

October 31, 2019 HF: All comments cleared. Please ensure that during the PPG phase these targets are ground-truthed, adjusted as needed and explained. I don't know if 20%, 40%, or 50% or more is appropriate but whatever the final target for female participation is it should be based on an understanding of the context, gender dynamics, needs and an explanation included.

Agency Response

Yes, the PPG will include gender assessment. The target has been changed to 50% women's participation.

The issue of possible inequitable costs and benefits to women has been incorporated under risk section along with elite capture issue mentioned by UA in another question.

The following has been added:

The project will ensure gender equity and women's empowerment through integrated forest landscape management and demonstration of biodiversity-sensitive and sustainable production technologies and techniques. During the PPG, project will compile information on past gender assessments undertaken on

CFUGs in the project areas and will undertake additional gender assessment to ensure that the full design includes gender transformative approach based on FAO, GEF and GON guidance and include appropriate indicators in the results framework to track progress towards women's access and control over natural resources and benefits accruing through their sustainable use, as well as their participation and decision making roles.

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019 HF: Please provide examples of private sector entities the project has engaged to date, and specifically what type of forest based enterprises/private sector partnerships are envisioned? This is an area with long history in Nepal-with which FAO has engaged (e.g. ANSAB) so we would expect a robust network and set of ideas/potential enterprises/private sector partnership out of Component 3 of this project.

October 31, 2019: Comment cleared. During the PPG phase please ensure that the identification and design of any enterprise activities are based on a strong theory of change linking back to conservation outcomes and impacts. This should be an evidence-based approach that draws on lessons learned from decades of failures and few success regarding positive conservation outcomes from enterprise development. The CER needs to address this issue directly.

Agency Response

ANSAB has been added in table on stakeholders.

Please see Output 3.5, where the following has been added:

There exist functional value chains for multiple products (e.g. Large Cardamom, Chiraito and other Medicinal herbs, tea, plywood, ringal bamboo, Nepalese paper (lokta), dairy products, spices, broomgrass, potato). These value chains include large numbers of local producers, traders, technicians, processors, networks, collectors, transporters and agrovets. There are many small processing plants in the target area, however, this situation is changing with increasing numbers of larger processing plants located outside the area (especially in the Terai)

because of more favourable climate (e.g. for drying products) and better access to labour, transport, power and equipment . The value chains need streamlining (addressing of bottlenecks), expansion, innovation, and greater inclusion of poor, socially excluded and remote communities.

The private sector will be engaged in the project as follows:

The Chamber of Commerce and Industries and representatives from relevant enterprises and producers will be engaged in (reviews of) value chain assessments (mostly NTFP and ecotourism) and multi-stakeholder coordination and planning mechanisms that prioritise and plan the interventions.

The project will support households and small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) that are involved, or have the potential to be involved in the sustainable use of biodiversity or ecosystem services.

The project will seek to build partnerships between the private-sector and households/CFUGs who have an interest in linking to value chains that support sustainable use of natural resources.

For the targeted value chains, the project will engage with all relevant stakeholders that can, or have the potential to, contribute to the livelihoods of CFUG members and households including, forest products, agriculture, and tourism with the aim of establishing public-private partnerships that demonstrate economically viable biodiversity-sensitive and sustainable livelihood models.

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019: UA: please assess climate risk and other MAJOR risks (elite capture? unintended negative impacts of enterprises on BD etc).

October 31, 2019: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

Following additional risks have been added:

| | | | |
|---|-----------------|--|--|
| Elite capture of project benefits; particularly unequal distribution cost and benefits to women | Low to moderate | The project will ensure strong participatory approach, transparency and capacity building of more marginalized groups to ensure that there is no elite capture of benefits. The government is also committed to ensuring this, and through strong partnership with other partners and CSO, the project is expected to mitigate this threat. Strong gender assessment and strong involvement of women will be promoted to ensure that women have equitable share of benefits and are not bearing additional cost/ burden. | |
| Climate variability and Change impacts | Moderate | Shorter term climate variability is likely affect local conservation and rehabilitation efforts and the project will ensure that climate resilient approaches are prioritized and promoted. Close cooperation with proposed GCF project in Province 1 is also expected to support climate resilience perspectives of the GEF project. | |

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019:

UA: Please clarify exactly what is meant/intended by FAO will support the execution of the project.

As the agency is well aware of, the implementation and execution roles on GEF projects are meant to be separate as per GEF policy and guidelines. The GEFSEC will analyze any requests for dual role playing by an agency at the time of CEO endorsement and only approve those cases that it deems warranted on an "exceptional" basis, based on country requests. We strongly encourage the project proponents to

look at third party options as a preferred way forward. We also strongly encourage the agency to discuss any and all options for project execution that do not include the government with the GEFSEC early in the PPG phase. The potential technical clearance of this PIF in no way endorses or encourages any alternative execution arrangement.

HF: The extensive experience of WWF, World Bank and USAID with supporting CFUGs in Nepal (in TAL, and the West/far West) should certainly be included from a coordination and learning perspective. Please expand this potential under section # 6 Coordination.

October 31, 2019: All comments cleared.

Agency Response

The execution text has been amended.

The MoFE will be the lead project execution agency and will be responsible for overall execution along with other national partners. FAO, will provide the necessary quality assurance and technical oversight as the GEF Implementing Agency. Nevertheless, MoFE capacities will have to be assessed and FAO's due diligence to assess fiduciary risks associated transferring GEF resources to MoFE will have to be undertaken in line with provisions of the GEF Minimum Fiduciary Standards. . The intention is that MoFE will act as executing agency and if that will not be possible as a result of the fiduciary assessment, third non-FAO parties will be considered. In such case, GEF SEC will be consulted early on in the PPG process on the best recommended execution modalities.

Coordination section has been strengthened- the following has been added:

The project will ensure strong coordination with projects supporting community forestry and natural resources management being supported through the World Bank, USAID, and other donors/ partners. It will ensure strong coordination with ongoing GEF projects such as the WWF-GEF Integrated Landscape Management to Secure Nepal's Protected Areas and Critical Corridors and Sustainable Land Management in the Churia Range; GEF's Small Grants Programme; UNDP-LDFC Developing Climate Resilient Livelihoods in the Vulnerable Watershed in Nepal; UNEP-LDEF Catalysing Ecosystem Restoration for Climate Resilient Natural Capital and Rural Livelihoods in Degraded Forests and Rangelands of Nepal.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019: UA: Projects lacks alignment with national UNCCD strategy, in particular the LDN concept.

HF: Yes for BD.

October 31, 2019: All comments cleared.

Agency Response LDN targets have been added.

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019 HF:

1.) What is the proposed KMIS? Who is the audience for this? Can they actually access and use the information-how? We have sustainability concerns about investment a database: who is going to pay for it and keep it running/current/used over time?

2.) 2.2: please provide examples of the types of KM linkages that are envisioned.

October 31, 2019: All comments cleared.

Agency Response

1) Please see updated Output 2.2 and KM sections

Unde 2.2 : Mechanism for the systematic creation and sharing of Provincial KMIS linked to national database, developed, and operational.

Target: The KMIS developed for Province 1 on globally important biodiversity and SLM (LDN) related issues and linked to national database.

Indicative activities:

Multi-stakeholder workshop on which information to share and on sharing protocols.

Agreements with all linked agencies, networks, Information systems.

Testing the KMIS.

Design and develop how KMIS information will be processed and shared for wider learning.

The database will be housed in Province 1's Forest Research and Training Center and will be linked to national center at the Ministry of Forest and Environment. Both these agencies will ensure upkeep and updating of this. This KMIS are expected to be useful to local, Provincial and national level planners to implement landuse,, undertake EIA for development projects as well as help report to international conventions. The database will also help in monitoring the environmental status of the Province and identify biodiversity and LD hotspots. The database could also provide locations and activities of all relevant projects, helping better coordination and cooperation. biodiversity and LD hotspots. The database could also provide locations and activities of all relevant projects, helping better coordination and cooperation.

2) Please note the international links are primarily related to reporting to UNCDB and UNCCD and not linked to specific international database. Please see above.

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 24, 2019 HF: Yes. All clear.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

October 24, 2019 HF: No, not at this time. Please respond to GEFSEC review comments and resubmit.

October 31, 2019: Yes. All technical comments cleared.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The following issues have been flagged by GEFSEC PM for inclusion/attention at PPG and CEO endorsement request stages:

- Part II 2.) & 3.)
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Private Sector Engagement

/view Dates

| | PIF Review | Agency Response |
|----------------------------------|------------|-----------------|
| First Review | 10/24/2019 | 11/1/2019 |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 10/31/2019 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | | |