



Date: 03.02.2026

Recommendations for Manifesto

Ministry of Forests & Environment (MoFE)

Major recommendations:

- Establish a National Forest Monitoring System using satellite remote sensing and AI-based change detection within 18 months to provide monthly forest cover updates and automated alerts for deforestation, achieving transparent, real-time forest governance.
- Implement basic water quality improvement measures along major rivers and streams within three to four years to achieve cleaner, safer water for communities and ecosystems.
- Establish a national Cooperative Farming and Indigenous Crops Program that organizes smallholders into crop-specific cooperatives, scales climate-resilient and heritage crops, and connects them to premium domestic and international markets to deliver sustainable, higher and more stable incomes for farming households.
- Restructure the Ministry of Forests and Environment and its departments to improve service delivery, reduce corruption, and eliminate overlapping mandates.
- Amend outdated environmental and forest laws (Environment Protection Act, Forest Act, National Parks and Wildlife Conservation Act, and related regulations) to remove procedural bottlenecks while safeguarding environmental standards.
- Integrate locally led climate adaptation plans (LAPAs, community and municipal plans) into routine government planning, budgeting, and fiscal transfer systems, moving away from short-term, donor-driven projects.
- Develop a National Environmental Data System that requires all publicly funded environmental and climate projects to share standardized, open-access data, enabling evidence-based policymaking and transparency
- Create dedicated national mechanisms by establishing a Human–Wildlife Conflict/Green Fund to support affected communities, a National Environmental Authority to streamline EIA/IEE processes while safeguarding environmental standards, and a Forest and Climate Council to coordinate climate adaptation, finance, standards, and disaster risk reduction.
- Shift from policy-making to implementation by operationalizing existing forest, climate, and carbon trading policies through a coordinated national mechanism under MoFE that embeds carbon trading, climate finance, and public awareness into routine government planning, budgeting, and transparent reinvestment in community-led climate and forest action.
- Establish and deliver a standardized Sustainable Village Blueprint under MoFE to rapidly coordinate energy, water, livelihoods, health, education, conservation, and tourism investments in remote municipalities mobilizing existing registered NGOs and

social enterprises to replace fragmented, project-based interventions with scalable, integrated village transformation.

- Institutionalize a mandatory, performance-based monitoring and accountability system across forest, environment, climate, and disaster-risk governance linking policy implementation, senior officials' performance evaluations, and international commitments to routine planning, budgeting, and Prime Minister-led oversight to ensure delivery rather than new policy proliferation. Establish a fully funded national early-warning and monitoring system for all extremely high-risk glacial lakes within three years to protect lives, infrastructure, and downstream ecosystems.
- Ensure that every local government has qualified environmental officers and that environmental assessments are led and reviewed by accredited environmental experts within one year.
- Establish a national insect and pollinator biodiversity monitoring network within two years and link development and agricultural approvals to verified biodiversity-risk safeguards.
- Revise environmental impact assessment laws within one year to ensure minimum ecological flows, protect aquatic ecosystems, and prevent approvals based on superficial assessments.

List of Contributors:

1. Aabha Shrestha (Environment and Water Management)
2. Carolyn Mills (Nepalaya / Sustainable Development / Climate Adaptation)
3. Deepak Raj Parajuli (Specialist in Climate Adaptation, Forestry, and Indigenous Knowledge)
4. Divas Sapkota
5. Dr. Rajan Prasad Paudel (Biodiversity and Climate)
6. Lal Mani Adhikari (Freelance Researcher/ Policy and System Strengthening)
7. Prahbat Pal
8. Prayan Pokhrel
9. Satyam Shah (University of Leicester; Geospatial Information & Remote Sensing)
10. Sujan Bhattarai (Environmental Data Science & AI)
11. Sunaina Sharma (Monitoring and Evaluation; GESI)

Technical Annex :

Recommendations for Prime Minister's Manifesto

Ministry of Forests & Environment (MoFE)

1. National Carbon Revenue & Climate Finance Mobilisation

Contributor: Lal Mani Adhikari

1. **Core Problem:** The primary governance failure is the inability to translate existing forest and climate policies into concrete, people-felt actions, resulting in policy overload but weak implementation.
2. **Manifesto Commitment:** The expert proposes improving nationwide public awareness and skills on climate change while committing to trade 50 million carbon credits within five years to generate approximately USD 2.5 billion for reinvestment in public climate interventions.
3. **Necessity & Feasibility:** The commitment is necessary and feasible because Nepal already has relevant policies, carbon trading regulations (2082), and international commitments, and success depends mainly on improved governance and stakeholder participation rather than new funding.
4. **Implementation Path:** Establish a high-level MoFE-led authority linked with REDD+ across all three tiers of government to institutionalize a National Carbon Revenue Framework using existing regulatory and climate finance systems.
5. **Timeline & Cost:** A five-year phased timeline is proposed, with governance and capacity building in year one, registration and issuance in years two to four, and carbon credit trading in year five, at a medium cost level.
6. **Risks & Constraints:** High capacity gaps and governance risks are the main constraints that could block effective implementation.
7. **Evidence Base:** The proposal is supported by national climate and forest policies, the Carbon Trading Regulation 2082, the National REDD+ Strategy, and recent carbon finance transactions involving Nepal.
8. **What Should NOT Be Promised:** No specific unrealistic or misleading policy commitments are identified by the expert.

2. Performance-Based Accountability for Environment, Climate, and Disaster Governance

Contributor: Sunaina Sharma

1. **Core Problem:** The primary governance failure is weak enforcement and accountability of existing forest, environment, climate, and disaster policies due to non-obligatory monitoring and evaluation and inadequate institutional commitment.
2. **Manifesto Commitment:** Institutionalise a mandatory, performance-based monitoring and accountability system across forest, environment, climate, and disaster-risk ministries within three months to ensure effective policy implementation and achievement of the SDGs by 2030.
3. **Necessity & Feasibility:** The commitment is necessary because Nepal already has strong policies and international commitments but weak performance-linked

accountability, and it is feasible within one term since legal and institutional structures already exist and require political enforcement rather than new laws.

4. **Implementation Path:** Use a Cabinet mandate to enforce a government-wide performance-based M&E system, link senior officials' evaluations to results, strengthen NPC and OPMCM oversight, integrate M&E into planning and budgeting, and ensure PM-led inter-ministerial coordination.
5. **Timeline & Cost:** The reform can be initiated and operationalised within 0–1 year and primarily involves policy and regulatory changes, with manageable medium-level institutional costs and limited infrastructure requirements.
6. **Risks & Constraints:** Political resistance, bureaucratic inertia, coordination challenges, and limited subnational M&E capacity may obstruct implementation unless mitigated by strong Prime Minister-led backing, incentives, phased rollout, and capacity strengthening.
7. **Evidence Base:** The proposal is supported by national strategies (NBSAP, NDC), SDG roadmaps, Auditor General reports, and existing government accountability frameworks.
8. **What Should NOT Be Promised:** New policies, strategies, or unrealistic large-scale environmental outcomes within a single term should be avoided; the focus must remain on enforcing and implementing existing commitments.

3. Delivering Integrated Sustainable Villages in Remote Municipalities **Contributor: Carolyn Mills**

1. **Core Problem:** Absence of a single, execution-ready national Sustainable Village Blueprint and delivery mechanism to coordinate integrated investments (energy, water, farming, health, education, conservation, tourism) in remote municipalities, resulting in fragmented, slow, and non-scalable interventions despite the presence of capable, registered implementers.
2. **Manifesto Commitment:** Deliver 100 sustainable, self-reliant villages in remote municipalities within three years using a standardized Sustainable Village Blueprint, mobilizing government-registered NGOs/social enterprises to rapidly back-fill missing services and replicate proven models nationwide.
3. **Why Necessary & Feasible:** Integrated blueprints address compounded rural disadvantages more effectively than piecemeal projects, and feasibility is high because Nepal already has proven technical solutions and registered implementers that can be coordinated and replicated rapidly without creating new institutions.
4. **High-Level Implementation Path:** Establish a Sustainable Village Delivery Unit to issue one national blueprint with minimum service standards, pre-qualify implementers under framework contracts, finance village packages through blended funding, and enable replication via performance-based grants and knowledge cross-pollination.
5. **Timeline & Cost:** Blueprint and pilots within 0–1 year; scale to 100 villages within 1–3 years; medium cost level due to modular, scalable solutions and existing unit-cost benchmarks.
6. **Risks & Mitigation:** Risk of coordination failure and solution fragmentation,

mitigated by enforcing a single non-negotiable blueprint, outcome-based contracting, transparent unit costs, and joint cross-sector planning prior to fund release.

7. **Key Evidence:** Nepalaya Sustainable Village Blueprint (2024); World Bank (2014) and peer-reviewed cost benchmarks on micro-hydropower; GSTC (2024) community homestay capacity-building evidence.
8. **Should Not Be Promised:** One-off rural grants or isolated infrastructure interventions, which evidence shows do not deliver durable village transformation without integrated service packages.

4. National GLOF Early Warning & Resilience Programme

Contributor: Carolyn Mills

1. **Core Problem:** Absence of a nationally coordinated, fully funded, execution-ready early warning and monitoring system for glacial lake outburst floods (GLOFs), despite 42 glacial lakes already classified as extremely high-risk and the availability of proven monitoring technologies and cost benchmarks within Nepal.
2. **Manifesto Commitment:** Deliver a fully funded national early-warning and monitoring system for all extremely high-risk glacial lakes within three years to protect lives, infrastructure, and downstream ecosystems.
3. **Why Necessary & Feasible:** GLOF risk presents an immediate, catastrophic threat with irreversible consequences for downstream communities and national infrastructure. Feasibility is high because Nepal has already implemented advanced lake monitoring systems (e.g., Tsho Rolpa), with known capital and operational costs, trained local capacity, and strong alignment with international climate finance priorities that can be scaled through a unified national programme.
4. **High-Level Implementation Path:** Mandate a single lead agency to consolidate national GLOF risk assessments and define a standard early-warning system design; establish a national GLOF Early Warning and Resilience Programme with ring-fenced multi-year funding; deploy standardized monitoring equipment supported by trained local custodians; develop a centralized, AI-enabled data and alert platform; and align implementation with national climate and disaster-risk strategies and provincial land-use planning.
5. **Timeline & Cost:** Blueprint design and pilots within 0–1 year; national rollout to all 42 lakes within 1–3 years; high cost level, mitigated by economies of scale and external climate finance.
6. **Risks & Mitigation:** Risks include institutional fragmentation and dependence on donor funding. These are mitigated through Cabinet-level mandate of a lead agency, integration into legally backed national strategies, multi-year budgeting, and performance-linked donor commitments.
7. **Key Evidence:** ICIMOD (2020) glacial lake risk assessments; UNDP–Government of Nepal Tsho Rolpa EWS documentation; Green Climate Fund (2025) GLOF risk reduction approval; international AI-for-climate financing precedents.
8. **Should Not Be Promised:** Further isolated research or lake-by-lake studies without a

quantified, time-bound national rollout of monitoring and early warning systems.

5. Professional Environmental Governance at Local Level

Contributor: Divas Sapkota

1. Core Problem: Failure to implement existing policy provisions requiring environmental officers at the local-government level, resulting in environmental assessments being conducted or approved without adequate environmental expertise and weakening enforcement of environmental safeguards under Nepal's federal system.
2. Manifesto Commitment: Ensure that every local government has qualified environmental officers and that environmental assessments are led and reviewed by accredited environmental experts within one year.
3. Why Necessary & Feasible: Environmental impacts of development projects are increasing under federalization, yet implementation capacity remains weak at the local level. This reform is feasible because the legal basis already exists under the Environment Protection Act and related regulations, requiring primarily administrative enforcement, recruitment, and accreditation rather than new legislation.
4. High-Level Implementation Path: Mandate recruitment or deployment of qualified environmental officers in all local governments; enforce accreditation requirements for environmental assessment leadership; strengthen review committees and approval timelines under existing EPA/EPR provisions; reject non-compliant or superficial assessment reports; and standardize public participation thresholds for environmental hearings.
5. Timeline & Cost: Implementation within 0–1 year; medium cost level associated with staffing, accreditation, and oversight.
6. Risks & Mitigation: Risks include administrative inertia and resistance to changing existing staffing practices. These can be mitigated through central enforcement directives, standardized recruitment criteria, and linking project approvals to compliance with professional environmental review requirements.
7. Key Evidence: Environment Protection Act (2019); Environment Protection Rules (2020); federal environmental governance frameworks.
8. Should Not Be Promised: Delegation of environmental assessments without professional qualification requirements, which undermines both environmental protection and public trust.

6. National Biodiversity & Pollinator Monitoring Network

Contributor: Prayan Pokharel

1. Core Problem: Policy and development decisions are made without routine, verified biodiversity risk data, particularly on insects and pollinators, leading to delayed detection of ecosystem damage and environmental impact assessments that function as paperwork rather than effective safeguards.

2. **Manifesto Commitment:** Establish a national insect and pollinator biodiversity monitoring network within two years and link development and agricultural approvals to verified biodiversity-risk safeguards.
3. **Why Necessary & Feasible:** Declining pollinator and insect populations directly threaten food security, ecosystem resilience, and rural livelihoods. Feasibility is high because Nepal already has a clear legal basis for monitoring and compliance under the Environment Protection Act, existing scientific capacity in universities and laboratories, and alignment with national biodiversity and climate commitments.
4. **High-Level Implementation Path:** Issue a Cabinet decision establishing a national monitoring network led by MoFE in coordination with MoALD; update EIA/IEE guidelines to mandate biodiversity-risk screening and monitoring; create a dedicated budget line with performance-linked disbursement; standardize protocols with academic institutions; and publish a public compliance and monitoring dashboard.
5. **Timeline & Cost:** Design and institutional setup within 0–1 year; operational monitoring within 1–3 years; medium cost level as a national programme.
6. **Risks & Mitigation**
Risks include sectoral pushback and limited local capacity. These are mitigated by framing monitoring as farmer-supportive risk prevention, phased rollout in priority areas, partnerships with universities, and transparent public reporting tied to funding.
7. **Key Evidence**
Environment Protection Act (2019); Nepal NDC 3.0; National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan; IPBES Pollination Assessment; IPCC AR6.
8. **Should Not Be Promised**
Immediate nationwide pesticide bans or claims of rapid transition to 100% organic agriculture without supporting monitoring, enforcement, and integrated pest management systems.

7. Strengthened Environmental Impact Assessment & Ecological Flow Protection **Contributor: Prabhat Pal (Watershed & Forestry)**

1. **Core Problem:** Existing Environmental Impact Assessment guidelines fail to incorporate scientifically grounded ecological flow requirements, resulting in hydropower and infrastructure approvals that degrade aquatic ecosystems and endangered species habitats while weakening long-term river and dam sustainability.
2. **Manifesto Commitment:** Revise environmental impact assessment laws within one year to ensure minimum ecological flows, protect aquatic ecosystems, and prevent approvals based on superficial assessments.
3. **Why Necessary & Feasible:** Current “rule-of-thumb” flow allocations are inadequate for ecosystem protection and undermine both biodiversity and infrastructure longevity. Reform is feasible within one term because it requires guideline and regulatory updates rather than new institutions, and aligns with hydropower sustainability and conservation objectives.
4. **High-Level Implementation Path:** Revise EIA and IEE guidelines to mandate ecological

flow assessments; integrate cross-ministerial coordination for water, energy, and environment approvals; strengthen review standards and compliance checks; and link approvals to enforceable flow and ecosystem protection conditions.

5. **Timeline & Cost:** Policy revision within 1–3 years; low cost level as a regulatory reform.
6. **Risks & Mitigation:** Perceived resistance from project developers can be mitigated by demonstrating that ecological flow protection prolongs dam life, reduces conflict, and supports sustainable hydropower outcomes.
7. **Key Evidence:** Environmental Impact Assessment and Initial Environmental Examination Guidelines (2019); river ecosystem and flow sustainability studies.
8. **Should Not Be Promised:** Unconditional project fast-tracking that ignores ecological flow requirements and long-term ecosystem impacts.

8. National Corporative Farming

Contributor: Carolyn Mills

1. **Core Problem:** Absence of a national, coordinated framework to organize smallholder farmers into crop-specific cooperatives for climate-resilient and indigenous crops, resulting in fragmented production, low bargaining power, weak market access, and underutilization of Nepal’s biodiversity and heritage crop potential.
2. **Manifesto Commitment:** Deliver a national Cooperative Farming and Indigenous Crops Programme that organizes smallholders into crop-specific cooperatives, scales climate-resilient and heritage crops, and connects them to premium domestic and international markets to raise and stabilize farm incomes.
3. **Why Necessary & Feasible:** Fragmented farming keeps producers locked into low-value local markets despite strong demand for traceable, climate-resilient, and indigenous products. Feasibility is high because cooperative structures, value-chain NGOs, and export-oriented agribusinesses already exist; what is missing is a government-backed framework to align incentives, standards, aggregation, and market access at scale.
4. **High-Level Implementation Path:** Mandate a national cooperative farming framework defining priority crop baskets and governance standards; support professionalization of crop-specific cooperatives; establish a value-chain and market-access facility for certification, branding, and offtake contracts; invest in shared aggregation and processing hubs; and enable bioprospecting partnerships under clear access-and-benefit-sharing rules.
5. **Timeline & Cost:** Policy framework and pilots within 0–1 year; scaling to multi-district cooperative clusters within 1–3 years; medium cost level due to programmatic support and shared infrastructure.
6. **Risks & Mitigation:** Risks include weak cooperative governance, elite capture, and logistics constraints. These are mitigated through strict governance standards, professional management, clustered infrastructure investment, and blended public–private financing.
7. **Key Evidence:** Nepalaya Indigenous Crops Programme (2025); cooperative value-chain literature; biodiversity hotspot and indigenous crop assessments.
8. **Should Not Be Promised:** Input subsidies or isolated seed and equipment distribution

without cooperative aggregation, quality control, traceability, and market contracts.

9. Mainstreaming Locally Led Adaptation into Government Systems

Contributor: Deepak Raj Parajuli (Climate Adaptation & Indigenous Knowledge)

1. **Core Problem:** Locally led adaptation plans (LAPAs, community and municipal plans) are treated as short-term projects rather than integrated into routine government planning, budgeting, and climate finance systems, leading to fragmented implementation and limited long-term impact.
2. **Manifesto Commitment:** Integrate all locally led adaptation plans into regular government planning, budgeting, and climate finance processes within one year to ensure durable, locally grounded climate resilience.
3. **Why Necessary & Feasible:** Nepal has strong adaptation planning frameworks but weak execution due to poor alignment with public financial management. Evidence shows adaptation is most effective when embedded in formal institutions rather than donor-driven projects. Feasibility is high because reform primarily involves aligning existing plans with budgeting tools such as climate budget tagging and intergovernmental fiscal transfers.
4. **High-Level Implementation Path:** Harmonize adaptation planning frameworks under national guidelines; require adaptation priorities in annual plans at all government levels; link climate budget tagging to local priorities; shift from project-based to programmatic, multi-year financing; and monitor long-term outcomes rather than short-term outputs.
5. **Timeline & Cost:** Integration within 0–1 year; low cost level as a policy and systems reform.
6. **Risks & Mitigation:** Resistance from project-oriented institutions and limited local capacity can be mitigated through clear integration rules, targeted capacity support, and dedicated adaptation funding windows.
7. **Key Evidence:** LAPA Framework; National Climate Change Policy; Office of the Auditor General reports; IPCC AR6; UNFCCC Locally Led Adaptation principles.
8. **Should Not Be Promised:** Creation of new adaptation plans or pilot tools instead of fixing integration and financing of existing plans.

10. Practical Water Quality Protection for Rivers and Streams

Contributor: Aabha Shrestha (Environment & Water Management)

1. **Core Problem:** Rivers and streams face increasing pollution from urbanization and unmanaged discharges, while enforceable water quality controls and interim treatment measures remain weak or absent, leading to avoidable ecosystem and public health degradation.
2. **Manifesto Commitment:** Implement practical water quality improvement measures along major rivers and streams within three to four years to protect ecosystems and

ensure safer water for communities.

3. **Why Necessary & Feasible:** Preventing pollution early is far more cost-effective than large-scale restoration later. Proven, low-maintenance treatment measures can be deployed quickly at discharge points and adapted to local conditions. This is feasible using existing construction capacity, governance structures, and phased implementation alongside longer-term basin management reforms.
4. **High-Level Implementation Path:** Designate a national lead for water quality governance; harmonize water, environment, and public health regulations; set enforceable water quality standards; integrate commitments into national and subnational plans; establish sustainable financing and compliance mechanisms; and strengthen inter-governmental coordination and reporting.
5. **Timeline & Cost:** Phased rollout within 1–5 years; mixed cost profile, with early low-cost regulatory actions and targeted infrastructure investments.
6. **Risks & Mitigation:** Institutional fragmentation and funding gaps can be mitigated through clarified mandates, dedicated budgets, strengthened enforcement capacity, and transparent performance monitoring.
7. **Key Evidence:** International water-sensitive urban design guidelines; flood and stormwater management manuals; applied practice from comparable jurisdictions.
8. **Should Not Be Promised:** Claims to eliminate flooding or water pollution through single, large-scale infrastructure projects.

11. Forest Sector Reform & Human–Wildlife Conflict Reduction

Contributor: Dr. Rajan Prasad Paudel (Biodiversity & Climate)

1. **Core Problem:** Outdated laws, inefficient organizational structures, and weak accountability within the forest sector hinder effective service delivery, sustainable forest utilization, and management of human–wildlife conflict.
2. **Manifesto Commitment:** Reform forest and environment institutions within one year and implement a national human–wildlife conflict management programme to significantly reduce conflict impacts on vulnerable communities.
3. **Why Necessary & Feasible:** Despite strong resource potential, institutional inefficiencies limit public benefit from forests and environmental services. Reform is feasible through legal amendments, organizational restructuring, and targeted funds, without large capital investment, provided there is political commitment.
4. **High-Level Implementation Path:** Amend key environmental and forest laws; restructure ministry departments for efficiency; establish a dedicated human–wildlife conflict fund; simplify EIA/IEE processes while maintaining safeguards; and strengthen climate and forest coordination mechanisms.
5. **Timeline & Cost:** Reforms initiated within 0–1 year; medium cost level due to institutional restructuring and targeted compensation mechanisms.
6. **Risks & Mitigation:** Bureaucratic resistance can be mitigated through incentives, redeployment, and clear performance accountability.
7. **Key Evidence:** Forest economics and conservation literature; Environment Protection

Act; High-Level Commission reports.

8. **Should Not Be Promised:** Institutional expansion without reform or enforcement accountability.

12. National Forest Monitoring System (Satellite & AI-Based)

Contributor: Satyam Shah

1. **Core Problem:** Nepal lacks a unified, real-time forest monitoring system, resulting in delayed detection of deforestation and weak enforcement of forest protection commitments under REDD+ and NDC frameworks.
2. **Manifesto Commitment:** Establish a National Forest Monitoring System using satellite remote sensing and AI-based change detection within 18 months to enable transparent, real-time forest governance.
3. **Why Necessary & Feasible:** Global evidence shows satellite monitoring dramatically improves forest law enforcement. Nepal already has access to free satellite data, technical partnerships, and climate finance aligned with monitoring and MRV requirements, making this achievable within one term.
4. **High-Level Implementation Path:** Create a dedicated geospatial monitoring unit; deploy cloud-based monitoring infrastructure; integrate alerts with enforcement agencies and community forestry networks; secure sustainable financing through REDD+ and bilateral partners.
5. **Timeline & Cost:** Operational system within 1–3 years; medium cost level using open-source tools and free imagery.
6. **Risks & Mitigation:** Capacity and coordination risks are mitigated through partnerships, clear leadership, and embedding the system within permanent government structures.
7. **Key Evidence:** REDD+ Strategy; international satellite monitoring case studies; NICFI satellite programme.
8. **Should Not Be Promised:** Claims of complete deforestation elimination through technology alone.

13. National Environmental Data Lake & Open Data Governance

Contributor: Sujan Bhattarai

1. **Core Problem:** Environmental data is fragmented, paper-based, and inaccessible, limiting evidence-based policymaking, transparency, and accountability in climate, pollution, and disaster management.
2. **Manifesto Commitment :** Establish a National Environmental Data Lake within two years, requiring all publicly funded environmental projects to share standardized data through open APIs.
3. **Why Necessary & Feasible:** Transparent data systems are essential for climate finance, monitoring, and informed decision-making. Feasibility is high due to availability of modern cloud platforms, international precedents, and the ability to mandate data sharing through policy rather than large infrastructure investment.

4. **High-Level Implementation Path:** Mandate open data sharing for publicly funded projects; build a cloud-based data platform with public access; appoint data officers in key agencies; require industry emissions reporting through EIA enforcement; and invest in analytical capacity.
5. **Timeline & Cost:** Operational within 1–3 years; medium cost level as a national data programme.
6. **Risks & Mitigation:** Institutional resistance and capacity gaps can be mitigated through PMO-level oversight, phased implementation, and early demonstrator applications.
7. **Key Evidence:** Nepal NDCs; international open data policies; World Bank OpenDRI guidance.
8. **Should Not Be Promised:** Full digitization of all historical records within one term.