

# Rehabilitation and Integrated Sustainable Development of Algerian Cork Oak Forest Production Landscapes

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

9806

**Countries**

Algeria

**Project Name**

Rehabilitation and Integrated Sustainable Development of Algerian Cork Oak Forest Production Landscapes

**Agencies**

FAO

**Date received by PM**

4/11/2019

**Review completed by PM**

1/8/2020

**Program Manager**

Pascal Martinez

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

**PIF** ☐

**CEO Endorsement** ☐

**Project Design and Financing**

**1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

No significant changes. Cleared.

**Response to Secretariat comments**

## 2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?

### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Please consider the following comments:

1. The project description (Part II section 1) needs to be revised. A description for each part a, b, c, d, e and f is expected. It isn't clear enough to refer to some sections of the project document (as for a, b and c) or simply say that there is no significant change since the PIF. Please provide an updated description with written paragraphs. Notably the proposed alternative scenario (c), the incremental/additional cost reasoning (d) and the innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up (f) need to be completed and clear to demonstrate that the project design is appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs.
2. In component 1, the outputs aim at elaborating management plans in 3 pilot sites while the outcome is the effective sustainable management of these site. It is unclear what will allow the effective adoption and implementation of the plans. Please explain the project activities that will ensure the plans are indeed implemented.
3. The results in the core indicators table (4,000 ha of indicator 1 and 18,350 ha of indicator 4) do not reflect the target in table B of 350,000 ha of cork oak forest with integrated management plans. Please explain and ensure consistency of results throughout the document.

### 3 July 2019

Thank you for the information provided and clarification. Cleared.

### Response to Secretariat comments

1. Point well taken. By highlighting the changes since PIF with a justification for each proposed change into table format, we hoped to answer the question (If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?) in a clear and concise manner. This way of presenting information has been welcomed by other reviewers. We have nevertheless summarized the sections from the ProDoc.
2. Proposed Output 1.2 is “Sustainable forest management plans for biodiversity conservation and income generation for local populations are developed and implemented in three sites.” The purpose of the activities under this output is to arrive at standardized management plans for the pilot forest sites that consider updated information on the state and use of the forest resources for conservation and sustainable use. The reasons why these plans will be indeed implemented are:
  - adequate financial provisions and planning for the implementation will be secured and designed under the project (as described in the ProDoc, a results-based budget and financing plan will be part of the SFM plans);
  - the interest and ownership of all relevant stakeholders will be secured during the participatory preparation of the SFM plans, thereby maximizing the chances for a smooth implementation of the SFM plans;
  - the governance for the implementation phase will be collectively discussed and clearly stated in two of the components of the SFM plans, namely: i) governance plans with a clear description of roles and responsibilities for each category of stakeholder, from the government to the private operators benefiting from forest resources; and ii) a set of agreed rules of use and management principles for the sites;

the SFM plans will be comprehensive and scientifically sound, being informed by international best practices and benefitting from the results of Output 1.1 (i.e. “Local and national diagnostics and census of biodiversity are completed and provide a basis for sustainable management”), which was specifically designed to establish the best technical conditions for the development, implementation and monitoring of the SFM plans.

3. 3. Our suggestion was to make a distinction between areas under ongoing improved practices (corresponding to the GEF Core Indicators) and areas with approved integrated management plans, the implementation of which may not have started before the termination of the project. The three pilot sites correspond to an area of 22,530 ha of COFs, of which 4,000 ha are currently protected. Therefore, the proposed target for the Core indicator 4 is  $22,530 - 4,000 = 18,530$  ha actually under improved practices by the end of the project. The 350,000 ha indicated as a target in Table B would be areas for which improved management plans have been approved, but not necessarily started to be implemented by the end of the project.

The error in the core indicator worksheet has been corrected. Apologies for the inconsistency.

---

[1] A detailed description of the content of Sustainable Forest Management plans is proposed in the ProDoc, paragraph 36.

**3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

Component 3: The resources may be limited to achieve a scaling-up at national scale of the pilot activities (around \$50 per hectare). Please explain the project capacity of scaling up with the allocated resources and describe the related activities.

**3 July 2019**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

The project’s intervention strategy is to demonstrate the feasibility and efficiency of the sustainable management of COF in three pilot sites, thereby setting the conditions for the upscaling of best practices at the national scale. Given the limited resources available at this stage, this upscaling phase will consist of the design and adoption of national-level management plans under Component 3, based on the lessons learned from Component 1 and 2. It is therefore not envisaged to use the project’s resources to implement the nation-wide plan, which will be done upon termination of the project with the regular resources of the DGF and other relevant national partners, as this is part of their mandate.

As described in the Workplan (Annex III of the ProDoc), the proposed activities to achieve this upscaling under Output 3.1 are:

- create a national technical platform to support cork oak forest ecosystems;
- finalize the typology of cork oak forest ecosystems;

- develop and implement a database on Algeria cork oak forest ecosystems;
- based on lessons from Outcomes 1 and 2, develop guidelines on approaches to participatory, integrated management of cork oak forests that conserve biodiversity;
- train all forestry staff in all Forest Wards across Algeria with cork oak forests; and
- develop management plans for all Wards in Algeria with cork oak forests.

**4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

In the portal, the proposal says that "The risk log has been included as Annex V in the project document". Please note that the required information has to be put in the portal form and complete accordingly.

**3 July 2019**

Thank you for complementing the information in the Portal. Cleared.

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

The risk log has been inserted into section A.5 in the Portal, as requested.

**5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** Yes. Cleared.

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

**6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** Not applicable.

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

**7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** Not applicable.

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

**8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

Partly. Under the baseline scenario, few initiatives are mentioned but it is unclear if these are the only relevant initiatives. In addition, we don't know if there is any relevant regional/international initiatives or plans. Please explain and complete as necessary.

**3 July 2019**

Thank you for the new inputs. Cleared.

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

This section has been updated with further information presented in the ProDoc. The initiatives described in the baseline scenario are all the ones that were identified by the partners during the participatory project development process.

The main regional/international relevant initiative that was identified is the regional FAO project “Amélioration de la transparence et de l'exhaustivité des données sur l'utilisation des terres dans les rapports NDC (Nationally Determined Contribution) “(Strengthening the transparency and the exhaustivity of data on land use in Nationally Determined Contributions), that aims to help beneficiary countries strengthen their capacities to report to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). It will also support the acquisition of knowledge on climate change mitigation, including in a South-South cooperation perspective. The database to be developed through the project will be a key deliverable. The project complements the activities under Component 1 (increase of the knowledge base for the establishment of sustainable management plans).

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

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** Yes. Cleared.

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

**10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** Yes. Cleared.

## **Response to Secretariat comments**

### **Agency Responses**

**11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:**

### **GEFSEC**

#### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

The response isn't clear as Silva Mediterranea and the identified academic institutions are not mentioned in the project description (they appear only in the response to GEF Secretariat comment). Please explain accordingly and complete as needed.

**3 July 2019**

Thank you for complementing the information in the Portal. Cleared.

## **Response to Secretariat comments**

- Silva Mediterranea: the Silva Mediterranea network will be used to disseminate the reports, leaflets, scientific contributions and other information pieces that will be issued under Components 1 and 2. In particular, the project will build on the best practices and successes from past Silva Mediterranea projects, namely in the area of SLM and forest and landscape restoration. Also, Silva Mediterranea meetings and events, such as the Mediterranean Forest Week, provide a platform for the project to show success that could be replicated in other Mediterranean countries.
- The involvement of the Royal Botanical Garden at Kew has been discussed during the project's PPG phase, and is described in the ProDoc as follows in Section 1.1.3 under Output 1.1: "Training on long term germplasm conservation at international standards and on propagation at national scale will be provided by the RBG Kew This will help ensure that suitable genetic material of high value cork oak species and varieties remain available for forest regeneration in the long term." A note has been added to the CER.
- Local universities will mostly be involved in Output 1.1. This has been clarified in the ProDoc (Sections 1.1.3 and 1.4.2) and a note has been added in the CER.

### **STAP**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

We appreciate and note the responses in the Annex B, thank you. Nevertheless, we don't see in the project description how the proposal will address STAP comments. In addition to clearly demonstrate that STAP comments are addressed in the Portal form, we invite the agency to consider in particular the following:

- As regard to strengthening the global environmental benefits on land degradation, the response remains vague beyond the declaration that the proposed project will contribute to two objectives of the national strategy (for instance, has the proposal any objective on restoration and if so, how?).
- The response as regard to the assumptions associated with the expected results, or the references validating the information remains unclear.
- Regarding the stakeholder analysis, it is unclear how it informs the project design and activities.

### **3 July 2019**

The role of indigenous technical knowledge (as also commented by Canada) is not considered in the response. Please complete accordingly.

In addition, as regard to stakeholders section A.3, please do not only refer to a section in the project document but provide a summary in the portal as requested. This summary can provide useful information to answer STAP and Council comments. Please adjust accordingly.

In the gender section A.4, there is no description but only reference to the submitted document in this section with is the PPG report in French. Please provide the description as requested in English.

### **5 September 2019:**

Thank you for the added information. Cleared.

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

July 2019:

Indigenous technical knowledge: In Annex B, in response to the comments from Canada, more emphasis has been placed on the role of the traditional knowledge.

Stakeholder section A.3: Please, refer to section A.3 of the CER for the additional information provided about provisions made for successful stakeholder engagement, as well as a detailed matrix that looks into stakeholder profiles, consultation methods, findings and timing of past and future engagements.

Gender section A.4: Please, refer to section A.4 of the CER. It clarifies that the PPG reports are available in French only, as they served the sole purpose of informing the project design. I.e. reports to the GEFSEC in English were not yet mandatory when the project was designed. Nevertheless, the socio-economic study

provided useful information and insights on the present role and potential contribution of women in COF ecosystem management, use and conservation, and this for a number of different NTFPs.

Response to previous review:

- Global environment benefits on land degradation: point well-taken, thank you. The response to STAP comment has been further elaborated in the CER. The proposed project will contribute directly and significantly to Objectives 1 and 2 of the national land degradation neutrality strategy (namely 48 watersheds restored by 2035 and 475,000 ha reforested by 2025). In addition, the upscaling strategy for the restoration of COF across 25 Wilayas to be developed and adopted under Component 3 will pave the way for an even more important contribution towards these two objectives. This is part of the project's sustainability and upscaling strategy.
- The assumptions have been further substantiated in the response to the STAP comment in the CER, as well as in Annex XVI of the ProDoc.
- The stakeholder analysis informed the project design and activities through several avenues:
  - o It allowed to identify the relevant stakeholders (including NGOs, CBOs and representatives of the private sector) to be part of the decision-making of the project, including them in the various committees that have been foreseen;
  - o It allowed to identify the direct beneficiaries of activities (CBOs, private businesses), while also understanding who would be secondary beneficiaries and stakeholders;
  - o It allowed to identify what NTFP value chains can be strengthened beyond cork;
  - o It allowed to identify existing gaps and needs in terms of the strengthening of value chains;
  - o It allowed to assess the readiness of various stakeholders to engage in the participatory management of forests.

## GEF Council

### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

**3 July 2019**

The comments from Germany and Canada and the agency responses are indeed well identified in Annex B. Please ensure comments from these countries are fully addressed when they refer to STAP comments.

**5 September 2019:**

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

**Response to Secretariat comments**

July 2019:

Amendments have been made to address the comment. Additional information has been provided in the 2 relevant responses to questions from GEF Council Members.

Response to previous review:

Responses to the comments from Germany and Canada are in the same table of Annex B of the Portal form. They are at the bottom, after the comments from GEFSEC and STAP. Please, advise if not visible, as it may be the result of a glitch in the Portal.

**Convention Secretariat**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** Not applicable.

**Response to Secretariat comments**

**Recommendation**

**12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

Not yet. Please address the comments above and clearly indicate where they are addressed in the Portal form.

**8 July 2019**

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments in box 11.

In addition, we don't find uploaded the Stakeholder Engagement Plan - Section A.3 and the document on gender-responsive measures - section A.4. The document uploaded in both sections is the same one: the PPG report in French (is it a glitch in the Portal?). Please check if these documents are missing also from your side.

Finally please note that the submission of a document in these sections is not compulsory for a GEF-6 project but in case you have done relevant analysis, it would be useful to upload them here.

### 6 September 2019:

Thank you for the additional information provided. Nevertheless, we note that FAO will undertake executing functions that cannot be performed by the GEF Implementing Agency (unless the procedure for an exception is presented and the Secretariat approves such request, which can only be accepted on exceptional basis and with very strong justification). Please find an alternative arrangement for these executing functions or justify and explain exactly which executing functions FAO is going to do for this project and indicate clearly their associated budget for the GEF Secretariat's further review and decision.

(In addition, please note that the comment on the PPG report was not because it was in French but because it was uploaded in sections where information in English were missing and thus could not be provided by the French report).

### 1st October 2019

Thank you very much for the clarification. In order to complete the exception request for a GEF Implementing Agency providing execution services, please provide a letter from the government explaining clearly why it can't perform these functions and confirming there isn't any other entity in the country that can execute such functions. The letter already provided in the Prodoc doesn't have this important information to allow GEF Secretariat to make a decision.

### 14 January 2019

Not yet. Please address the following comments:

1. Executing partner type should be Government and not GEF Agency– please amend:

Other Executing Partner(s):	Executing Partner Type
Directorate-General for Forests (DGF), Ministry of Agriculture, Rural Development and Fisheries (MADRP)	GEF Agency

2. Break-downs of GEF amount into LD and BD are mismatched between table A and D – please amend:

## A. Focal Area Strategy Framework and Program

Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
LD-2_P3	Programme 3	GET	852,911	8,565,749
BD-4_P9	Programme 9	GET	2,558,733	15,907,822
Total Project Cost(\$)			3,411,644	24,473,571

## D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	NGI	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
FAO	GET	Algeria	Land Degradation		No	863,242	82,008
FAO	GET	Algeria	Biodiversity		No	2,548,402	242,098
Total Grant Resources(\$)						3,411,644	324,106

3. On core indicators: the submission is incomplete – for the sub-indicator 1.2 on improved management in protected areas, the CEO endorsement submission must include WPDA ID and the METT score baseline. Without the baseline the project will not be able to show improvement and the results won't be recorded.

**6 March 2020**

The remaining comments have been addressed, thank you. The CEO endorsement is now recommended.

## Response to Secretariat comments

26 February 2020

Please, see amendments in the CEO Endorsement Request and the completed TT in attachment.

14 November 2019:

Please, see attached a letter from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (original letter plus translation into English). In addition, the executing tasks carried out by FAO have been specified in the project document and the CER, respectively in paragraphs 123 and 132, and A.6 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination.

September 2019:

Please, consider the following elements, clarifying how the operational modality for the Algerian Cork Oak Forest project was decided upon.

Implementation arrangements have been discussed with the main execution partner, DGF, from the onset, and the proposed arrangements represent the request from the national partners for cost-effective project management, FAO expert technical inputs and availability of procedures that allow for stakeholder engagement, considering the decentralized nature of the project.

One of the criterion FAO applies when searching for possible project execution partners is the technical capacity of potential partners to deliver expected project results. In the case of the Algerian Cork Oak Forest project, both national and regional entities have been considered. DGF and FAO are the only two entities present in Algeria with the required expertise to deliver results, given the highly specialized technical nature and large geographical scope of the project. Furthermore, the engagement of an international partner unfamiliar with the technical specificities of the project and the execution partners in project sites, was considered counter-productive, costly to manage and complicating institutional arrangements unnecessarily.

In discussing with DGF their potential role as lead executing partner for this project, DGF made clear that they have restricted access to foreign currency, and has no budget holder responsibilities delegated by the Ministry of Finance. Given this unique situation in Algeria, DGF explicitly requested FAO to engage in project execution on their behalf.

DGF has therefore prepared and signed an official letter (Annex XI Request for execution support services from MARDF (DGF) to FAO in the Project Document) requesting FAO to deliver financial management support (including HR, procurement of services and goods), and guarantee cost-effective management (the cost of FAO providing these services is entirely included in the PMC, as per GEF procedures). This arrangement mirrors the arrangement the DGF already has to execute

other GEF activities (i.e. ABS project, with GEF ID 5808). As can be concluded from the budget included in Annex IV of the Project Document, the cost of FAOs participation in project execution is limited to USD48,000 - the amount needed to cover a part-time Finance and Admin Officer assisting the Project Management Unit with management functions, and far lower than the 5% PMC.

In addition, FAO's Letter of Agreement (footnote 1) operational modality allows for a wider partnership to be actively engaged in execution, providing a neutral platform for multi-level, multi-stakeholder and even multi-sector dialogue and learning. Through LOAs managed by FAO, but for which the delivery is overseen by the project Steering Committee headed by DGF, all non-commercial entities including local producer organisations, NGOs, academia and public entities, can be engaged in project execution. A national entity would not have had the financial instruments to engage these local stakeholders in the execution, reducing them to mere beneficiaries, rather than actors of change.

In sum, FAO did not seek an active role in project execution. It was requested by the main project execution partner DGF after having considered various modalities, criteria for timely, effective and efficient execution, and technical expertise eventually contributing to the capacity development of DGF.

Acknowledging the peculiarities of the Algerian Governmental Entities, GEFSEC's approval of these arrangements is requested, recalling that FAOs roles and responsibilities as implementing agency and executing agency are well understood, defined, costed and internal firewalls are present to diligently deliver its multiple responsibilities.

Footnote:

1. LOA are a cost-effective way to directly engage the services to be provided by non-commercial entities, transferring execution responsibilities to these executing partner(s). An LOA spells out the following: (i) objective, outcomes and outputs; (ii) technical and operational requirements including the type of services and expertise required; (iii) progress/performance indicators and means of verification linked to desired outputs and outcomes; (iv) detailed budget; (v) reporting requirements; (vi) monitoring mechanisms; (vii) inputs, as applicable, to be provided in kind by FAO; (viii) inputs, as applicable, to be provided free-of-charge by the executing partner; (ix) subcontracting and/or limited procurement, as applicable; (x) duration; and (xi) any other relevant information.

July 2019:

Comments in box 11 have been addressed.

With respect to the PPG reports, please note these have not been translated into English, as there was no obligation to carry out and share stakeholder engagement plans and gender analyses at the time of the project design. Still, socio-economic studies had been carried out, including a review of gender elements relating to COF ecosystem management. The information resulting from this study informed the project design. Because of the fact that the report does not comprehensively report back on the work carried out, is not a full-fledged gender analysis and is available only in French, a gender analysis report has not been attached. However, we are not able to delete the link in section A.4 that was established to the PPG reports previously.

**Review Dates**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** **Response to Secretariat comments**

<b>First Review</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

**Context:**

After decades of deforestation, less than 1% of the total country remains with forest cover, estimated at a total of 4 million ha, with an approximate 40,000 ha being lost annually. Cork forest ecosystems, which cover around 9% of the forest area, are particularly important in terms of environment and economic value, notably

providing critical ecosystem services and a variety of non-timber forest products (NTFPs). The cork is the most well-known NTFP product and is typically the single most economically valuable one.

Algerian cork forests are threatened by fire, unsustainable use of cork oak stands, unsustainable or excessive grazing, inappropriate harvesting of NTFPs and climate change. The poor condition of local rural population, which worsened with the declining of oil prices in 2014, has led more people to the rural areas and increased the pressure over the natural resources and particularly the forest ecosystems. As a result, the important deforestation and forest degradation, the ecosystem fragmentation threatening the biodiversity and the land degradation are undermining the resilience of nature and the population livelihood in a vicious circle.

**Project:**

With a support of \$3.4 million from the GEF, the objective of the proposed project is to conserve, sustainably harvest and manage Algeria's globally significant cork oak forest ecosystems. The overall project's approach is to develop the integrated management and use of the cork forests. Activities with local partners and authorities in three project sites will adopt a productive landscape approach that will consider not only cork, but also all the competing uses of the forest, to achieve a balanced management system that also promotes conservation. In its upscaling phase, the project will support central authorities and policy makers in initiating a broader reform of the governance system of cork forests, to be able to scale up local outcomes and ensure sustainability of results. The three main components of the project are: 1- Piloting of sustainable management, conservation and sustainable harvesting of Algeria's globally significant cork oak forests; 2- Sustainably creating value from cork oak ecosystem products, goods and services and 3- Replication and upscaling of successful approaches.

**Country priorities:**

The proposed project is fully consistent with the relevant national development programs and sector plans adopted by the Government of Algeria, as well as with the various programs and action plans formulated by the Algerian Government to meet the objectives of the relevant international Environmental Conventions. These priorities are notably reflected in the new "Forest Strategy until 2035" which establishes as priorities the sustainable management of the forest ecosystem and the economic valuation of forest products and ecosystem services, the Algeria's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan which includes the conservation and restoration of ecosystems, the participation of local stakeholders and their accountability for biodiversity conservation, and the national Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) report which includes the National Reforestation Plan aiming at replanting 1,25 million ha.

**Global Environment Benefits:**

The activities focused on the pilot sites will place approximately 22,530 ha of high biodiversity cork oak forest, including 4,000 ha of protected area, under sustainable management regimes, thereby enhancing the conservation of globally significant biodiversity as well as the conservation of the concerned land and water. The upscaling components of the project are expected to expand the best practices over the territory to achieve a target of 350.000 ha under sustainable land management in production systems, including 229.000 ha of improved management of landscapes to maintain globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and

services. The sustainable forest management is also likely to lead to increased sequestration of carbon that is not estimated at this stage but will be explored during the project implementation.

**Innovation, Scaling up, & Sustainability:**

The innovation mainly lies in the forestry practices to be demonstrated and replicated and the creation of an inclusive platform of cooperation between research, government and communities to support and maintain the sustainable management of cork oak forest ecosystems. sustainability will be developed through the management of the resources in cork forests to ensure that they are harvested with a long-term vision, and that appropriate sustainability practices are disseminated to appropriate stakeholders. The goal is for individual stakeholders to have an incentive to protect these valuable natural resources. Components 2 and 3 of this Project are entirely devoted to sustainability and upscaling. Component 2 focuses on developing the private sector linkages and the economic incentives to scale up, while the component 3 provides a more traditional approach to scaling-up, through the provision of training, the preparation of lesson learning tools and direct dissemination of tools and practices to cork oak forest managers across the country.

**Co-financing:**

The expected co-financing amount of \$ 24.5 million all comes from the National Government, mainly composed of a grant of \$ 19.8 million and the rest of in kind.