Vi
AGROFORESTRY

Emiti Nibwo Bulora, Tanzania

Annual report covering the period: 1st May 2014 to 30th April 2015

Submitted by: Vi Agroforestry
Date of submission: 1st September 2015

Table of Contents

Summary

Project overview	
Reporting period	May 2014 – April 2015
Geographical areas	*North West of Tanzania*
Technical specifications in use	Woodlot (3mx3m and 4mx4m), Dispersed Inter-planting (5mx10m), Fruit Orchard (8mx8m and 9mx9m) and Boundary Planting (3m apart)

Project indicators	Historical (2010-2014)	Added/ Issued this period (2014/2015)	Total
No. smallholder households with PES agreements	699	-104	595
No. community groups with PES agreements (where applicable) by Dec 2014	29	-4	25
Approximate number of households (or individuals) in these community groups			13800
Area under management (ha) where PES agreements are in place	373.33 ha and 91,291 metres	-71.33 ha and -17,091 metres	302 ha and 74,200 metres
Total PES payments made to participants (USD)	216,656	6,659	223,315
Total sum held in trust for future PES payments (USD)			168,918
Plan Vivo Certificates (PVCs) issued	56,992	0	56,992
Allocation to Plan Vivo buffer to date	14,248	0	14,248
Unsold Stock at time of submission (PVC)			19,251
Vintage 2011	19,251		
Plan Vivo Certificates (PVCs) requested for issuance this reporting period		0	

Part A: Project updates

This is the fifth annual report for the Emiti Nibwo Bulora project and it narrates the implemented project activities from the period of May 2014 to April 2015. The project area experienced an extreme, prolonged drought from the month of April 2014 to end of October 2014. Many of the replanted trees, grass and annual crops dried and that left serious food security issues for humans and livestock. The onset of the rain resumed at the end of the month of October when farmers once again started to replant and replace dead trees. Due to these circumstances, members of staff encouraged farmers to apply *sustainable land management practices* as a way to adapt to and to mitigate the impact of drought. Also, recommendations were made to use tree species that are more drought-tolerant than the indigenous *Maesopsis eminii,* which in fact does not tolerate the drought well.

In general, it has been a tiresome exercise for some of the farmers especially for those who did not use *sustainable land management practices* as proposed by the project. Some of them did not qualify according to the monitoring standards and that caused them to withdraw from the project. By contrast, those participants who implemented methods related to climate change adaptation and management of tree farms were able to grow trees very well.

Plate 1: A well-managed plan vivo plot

Uncontrolled fire burning happened during the reporting period and the outbreak of fires destroyed some of the planted trees even though farmers were advised to construct a firebreak belt to protect their farms. Sensitization on reducing/eliminating the occurrence of fires was done through environmental education by sub-village, village and ward level leaders. In reality, in all villages, there are strong by-laws on fire protection so that it was only a matter of making sure that those laws were enforced. Also, leaders emphasised that cleaning tree farms eliminates the occurrence of fire.

The project conducted Plan Vivo forum meetings to which group leaders and local leaders were invited to for the purpose of reviewing the implemented project activities, for planning future developments and for formulating a community consensus on how to address the potential challenges posed by the project's activities. They were fruitful forums as participants delivered reports from their groups that included many stories of farmers managing their trees successfully and using their received incentives in a useful manner. They also shared stories about their practical application of knowledge gained through various trainings/ facilitations undertaken by their groups, such as sustainable land management practices, household food security in changing climate and entrepreneurships skills. These trainings helped them to better organise their available resources and opportunities in order to establish and to manage a broader variety of micro-enterprises such as apiary, goat keeping, dairy cattle keeping, horticultural enterprises and others.

Plate 2: Plan Vivo participant with goat keeping enterprise

Moreover, the presence of local leaders at the forums motivated participants because the leaders actually agreed to help farmers with any problem that could arouse within their groups. The participants also advised group leaders to amend their group constitutions to better suit their needs and make their members adhere to the previously-agreed terms and conditions.

As a general practice, Vi Agroforestry's strategy is to work with local NGOs or farmers' networks. Based on that, the Plan Vivo project participants were encouraged to form networks with the understanding that, one day in near future, they would be able to stand on their own and to independently implement community activities with specific focus on tree planting as climate change mitigation measures. Networks were formed in Kaisho and Bugene and they are now finalising their constitutions.

Traditionally, there are no title deeds in village land unless a farmer himself/ herself initiates it. In practice, none of the project participants had title deeds. As a consequence, the method used locally to prove land ownership consisted of asking the neighbours of a specific project participant and their corresponding village chairperson to both sign a form to confirm ownership of that land. Proof of land ownership for *plan vivos* was conducted for all participants for the purpose of confirming the plots where they intended to plant trees as stipulated under the Plan Vivo agreements.

The piloting group was in its fifth year of implementation and the monitoring conducted on it consisted of DBH measurement activities. The outcome of the monitoring revealed that out of 22 farmers, only four qualified for the correct DBH average of 10 cm. The rest did not qualify even though their farms and trees were generally well-managed. In some of the non-qualifying farms in the piloting group, there was a combination of trees of different ages (due to replanting to replace the dried trees) that cause the average DBH to be lower than average.

This year, reviews of the technical specifications and the Project Design Document (PDD) will be conducted and the 5-yearly project verification is also expected to be carried out. Technical Specifications and the PDD are expected to be reviewed in November 2015, and the project verification will be carried out in the first quarter of 2016. The outcome of the technical specifications review will reveal the reality of tree growth as well as guide project management on us on any modifications to the monitoring targets.

Vi Agroforestry used this Plan Vivo project to promote agroforestry tree species. Under the *plan vivo* management plan, the focus was on trees to be planted on degraded/ abandoned land. However, experience shows that agroforestry trees have not been performing well on degraded/ abandoned land while trees grown using "Dispersed Inter-planting" or those grown on more fertile land are doing better. Therefore, Vi Agroforestry is seeking to identify alternatives tree species – those that better adapt to degraded land – rather than *Grevillea robusta, which* has been attacked by termites.

Facilitation sessions with groups

Vi Agroforestry staff followed up with various established enterprises within the Plan Vivo groups (as a group or individual). As far as the groups that engaged with Village Savings and Loan Associations are concerned, their members are accessing loans that are being used to pay for labour to weed their tree farms. Other trainings were also conducted on topics such as sustainable land management practices, integrated pest management, environmental education, sustainable energy and so forth (further information in part H of this report).

Project Visitors

In 2014/ 2015, the Project received a number of visitors as follows:

- Linda Andersson Communication Officer from Vi Agroforestry Program Office in Nairobi (interviewing farmers – communication)
- Anna Lagergren, responsible for sales and marketing at the Head office in Stockholm (familiarization with the project, visited some participants)
- CEO of Riksbyggen (familiarization with the project)
- Regional Directors for Vi Agroforestry and We Effect (familiarization with the project)
- Christopher Stephenson, Head of Operations, Plan Vivo Foundation (familiarization with the project)

Plate 3: Christopher Stephenson of Plan Vivo Foundation (second left) with Vi Agroforestry staff (Rolf and Grace) at Mr Policalipo's farm (on left)

Study tour to REDD+ Project

A team of Vi Agroforestry staff coordinating the Plan Vivo project visited a REDD+ project in Morogoro for the purpose of sharing knowledge on the different approaches between Plan Vivo and REDD+ methodologies. REDD+ works with communities surrounding targeted forests under conservation. Forest-related activities are abandoned for a certain number of years and, subsequently, carbon increment is then measured. Under REDD+ projects, payments are given to communities who then decide how to use them. Emiti Nibwo Bulora project works with individual farmers or community groups who voluntary opt to join the project and to plant trees for carbon-dioxide sequestration. By contrast, those who are not participating in the project continue with the activities that generally lead to an acceleration of deforestation and land degradation so as to create carbon leakage. Based on that discussion, Vi Agroforestry could also work with REDD+ by involving the communities at large in climate change mitigation.

Plate 4: Vi Agroforestry staff with REDD+ participants in Kilosa Morogoro

Challenges

Extreme drought was the major challenge encountered by participants during this reporting period. The situation affected replanted trees and annual crops to the extent of total crop failure. The project always emphasized to participants that they should use the proposed sustainable land management practices to enable them to produce in this changing climate. The use of soil and water conservation structures such as grass mulch, water harvesting systems and terraces has been stressed to farmers. Also, participants received training on how to address household food security in changing climate, which highlighted the use of improved seeds for early maturity and drought-resistant crop varieties such as cassava, yams and sorghum in order to secure them in times of famine.

As result of these difficulties, several participants have withdrawn or been removed from the project as they were discouraged by the harsh conditions and no longer wish to continue participating in the project. Reports suggest some thought trees could just grow with no ongoing management, something locally not considered necessary when planting exotics such as Pinus and Eucalyptus species. Currently, there are 620 participants (from 728 of last report). Those who have withdrawn did not put enough effort in the management of their plots. Their ambition was more to receive money rather than to benefit from trees. Based on that, Vi Agroforestry has decided to review the PES agreement to include a binding clause that will limit deliberate withdrawal from the project in such cases.

Table A1: Document updates - No updates have been made during this reporting period

Future Developments

Vi Agroforestry is planning to start recruiting new farmers to compensate for the amount of carbon not generated by those who have left the project. Many farmers are interested in joining the project and some have already established their farms according to the prescribed Plan Vivo management system while waiting to be registered. These are about 110 farmers and they will be given priority when the recruitment of new participants resumes in September and October 2015.

The Plan Vivo groups have been encouraged to join and to form networks that can then be registered under their respective districts. Vi Agroforestry intends to empower farmers' associations or networks to stand on their own and to serve their communities sustainably. The objective is to allow these groups to be in the position to conduct forest-related activities and environmental management practices independently by the time their contracts with Vi Agroforestry end. They could then easily get support from any interested partners, including the government, as long as they will have capacity to administer it.

Part B: Project activities

B1 Project activities generating Plan Vivo Certificates

Land use activities implemented in this reporting period continued to be those described in the PDD as "Woodlot" "Dispersed inter-planting", "Fruit orchard" and "Boundary planting". Existing participants managed their trees under those technical specifications. There was a significant drop in the area covered by the project due to drop out of some participants. In the last report (2013-2014), the area covered was 433 ha and 93,000 m while this year the coverage area is a total of 302 ha and 74,200m. However, Vi Agroforestry is preparing to recruit new potential participants to compensate for the lost tCO_2 and, hence, the coverage area is expected to increase soon. Currently, the area under management represents 620 participants, which are subdivided into 595 individual farmers and 25 community groups.

Table B1: Project activity summary

Name of technical specification	Area (Ha)/Distance (m)	No. smallholder households	No. Community Groups
Woodlot	258	452	25
Dispersed Inter-planting	42	83	0
Boundary Planting	74,200	162	0
Fruit Orchard	2	5	0

Note: Number of smallholder households (702) is greater than the actual figure of 595 because some have more than one technical specification.

B2 Project activities in addition to those generating Plan Vivo Certificates

Existing participants with woodlots continued to grow seasonal crops (including beans, Irish potatoes, maize, cassava, yams, etc.) in their Plan Vivo sites so that management of their tree farms has benefited other crops as well. Since most woodlots are established on degraded/abandoned land, this practice has enabled farmers to make better use of the land and to realise that sustainable land management helps land productivity.

Plate 5: Maize harvested from Plan Vivo plot.

Part C: Plan Vivo Certificate issuance submission

No submission for Plan Vivo Certificate issuance

Part D: Sales of Plan Vivo Certificates

The total number of credits issued by the project so far is 56,992**,** which are derived from the activities of 778 farmers. However, at the time of writing, 158 farmers have dropped out of the project so that only 620 are still active, meaning the total supports a reduced figure of 42,698 certificates. Currently, the total sold stock is 37,741 so that the remaining unsold stock is 19,251. The project sold 11,219 certificates in this reporting period.

As a consequence, there is currently a deficit of 14,294 tCO_2 (56,992 tCO_2 – 42,698 $tCO_{2)}$ in the project, which has triggered some reallocations of farmers and buyers. The project management has agreed to recruit new farmers to make up for the shortfall in emissions reductions. The Monitoring and Evaluation Officer is managing the situation well and has been regularly updating the Stockholm Office in regard to all reallocations taking place. The deficit will be made up by farmers to be recruited in September/ October 2015.

Table D1: Sales of Plan Vivo Certificates

S/No	Date of sale	Name of purchaser/source of funds	No. PVCs purchased	Price per PVC ($)	Total amount received ($)	Price to participants per PVC ($)[1]	% Sale price to participants
1	2010	Folksam	4,795				
2	2010	Naturrutan AB	127				
3	2011	Folksam	3,853				
4	2011	Alverbacks Blommor AB	375				
5	2011	Akademibokhandelsgruppen AB	28				
6	2011	Sweco Position AB	33				
7	2011	Naturrutan AB	371				
8	2012	LRF Samkop AB	16				
9	2012	Spridda Skurar AB	20				
10	2012	Lions Club International District 105N	357				
11	2012	Lansforsakringar Kalmar lan	137				
12	2012	Naturrutan AB	134				
13	2012	Folksam	3,969				
14	2012	Bokus AB	21				
15	2012	Naturrutan AB	145				
16	2012	Naturrutan AB	177				
17	2012	Bokus AB	10				
18	2012	Alverbacks Blommor	357				
19	2012	Svenka Motorcykel- och Snoskoterforbudent	67				
20	2012	Peter Besterman AB	318				
21	2012	Naturrutan AB	803				
22	2013	Bokus AB	78				
23	2013	Bokus AB	300				
24	2013	Lansforsakringar Kalmar lan	131				
25	2013	Kung Markatta AB	603				
26	2013	LRF Samkop AB	16.7				
27	2013	Equator Stockholm AB	34				
28	2013	LRF Samkop	13				
29	2013	Peter Besterman AB	248				
30	2013	Fonus, ekonomisk forening	245				
31	2013	CCAFS, CGIAR	128				
32	2013	Folksam	19				
33	2013	Folksam	2,122				
34	2013	Hotel Oden	207				
35	2013	Fonus, ekonomisk forening	223				
36	2013	Folksam	2472				
37	2013	Billogram	3				

[1] Farmers contracted in 2010 were paid 7 USD/tCO_2, yet contracts and payments were denominated in Tanzania shillings, at TSh 10,000/tCO_2

38	2013	Naturrutan AB	667	
39	2013	R Vibergs Blommor HB	60	
40	2013	Fonus, ekonomisk forening	231	
41	2013	AB KE Petterssons Handelstradgard	300	
42	2013	BioGaia AB	910	
43	2013	Alverbacks Blommor	374	
44	2013	Tubman AB	10	
45	2013	Naturrutan AB	145	
46	2013	Fonus, ekonomisk forening	231	
47	2014	Lantz Trafikskola AB	58	
48	2014	Svenska Motorcykel och snoskoterforbundet	68	
49	2014	Equator Stockholm AB	40	
50	2014	Bokus AB	300	
51	2014	Naturrutan AB	167	
52	2014	Tubman AB	5	
53	2014	CCAFS, CGIAR	145	
54	2014	Länsförsäkringar Kalmar län	110	
55	2014	Kung Markatta AB	614	
56	2014	Billogram AB	3	
57	2014	LRF Samköp AB	5	
58	2014	Fonus Ekonomisk Förening	252	
59	2014	Car to Go Sweden AB (tidigare Naturrutan)	167	
60	2014	Bio Gaia AB	1163	
61	2014	Hotel Oden	49	
62	2014	Sydskånes Avfallsaktiebolag (SYSAV)	24	
63	2014	Ny Reklambyrå i Sverige AB		
64	2014	Car to Go Sweden AB (tidigare Naturrutan)	167	
65	2014	LO-TCO biståndsnämnd	117	
66	2014	Fält Communications AB	117	
67	2014	Västanhem Mäkleri & Interiör AB	10	
68	2014	LRF Samköp AB	5	
69	2014	CarbZone AB	95	
70	2014	Car to Go Sweden AB (tidigare Naturrutan)	167	
71	2014	Fonus Ekonomisk Förening	229	
72	2014	Alverbäcks Blommar AB	366	
73	2014	Folksam	2792	
74	2014	Fonus Ekonomisk Förening	228	
75	2014	R. Vibergs Blommor HB	62	
76	2014	ZeroMission AB	2001	
77	2014	Fonus Ekonomisk Förening	228	
78	2014	Folksam	1862	
79	2015	AB KE Petterssons Handelsträdgård	241	
		TOTALS	**37,741**	**647,791**

Part E: Monitoring results

Monitoring was conducted on the piloting group that was in its fifth year of implementation as well as on those participants that did not qualify for second and third year in the previous reporting period (2013/2014). As far as the piloting group is concerned, only 4 participants out of 22 qualified. The rest did not qualify even though their tree farms are well managed with the exception of one participant (who since then has been deleted because they no longer expressed any interest in the project). Based on this experience, it is to believe that the previously estimated growth rate was very high compared to the real situation, but this will be revealed when review of technical specification will be done.

Moreover, agroforestry trees have not been performing well on the degraded land areas that are typically managed under a Plan Vivo system. In fact, the plots that were managed by the only four farmers that qualified are situated on more fertile land. Furthermore, by the end of this year we expect to take DBH measurements from ongoing participants. The trend of finding divergent DBH measurements will continue or probably even get worse because this group was so badly affected by drought that they kept on replanting young trees to replace the ones that had died. As a result, in many farms there are now trees of different ages (much younger than five years).

Also, participants who did not qualify last year (for second and third year payments) were allowed to replace dead trees. The intention of the Vi Agroforestry staff was to remove farmers that intentionally disqualified themselves by doing nothing on their farms. All farmers with a survival rate below 90% were advised either to replant trees up to required number or to withdraw from the project. This is because their presence in the registry and in the database would otherwise provide incorrect estimates of the expected tCO_2.

As a consequence, the participants who did not qualify have now been deleted (appendix 3) from the database. For the piloting group, unsuccessful monitoring was mainly due to poor soil conditions of the plots under management and to the nature of trees under the specific technical specification. By contrast, *Maesopsis eminii* has performed well under the “Dispersed inter-planting” system. So, to all those participants that have used it, the only recommended corrective action was to continue managing their farms rigorously and to undertake thinning activities where tree canopy is too large.

In plots where most trees have grown (3 to 4 years) the main corrective action that farmers are advised to do are weeding, prevention/ avoid burning and grazing, avoid cutting trees for firewood, thinning and avoid over pruning. Detailed monitoring results can be found in Appendix one.

Part F: Impact

There are various impacts associated with this Plan Vivo project in terms of ecosystem and livelihood improvements. Trees planted have been used to restore degraded areas and they have effectively added value to farmers’ land, increased vegetation cover and provided habitat for organisms such as birds and insects. Participants have been encouraged to use improved cook stoves and most of them have started to use these stoves. In general, the rate of tree cutting for firewood has been reduced, as the same bunch of firewood previously used for three days will now last a week.

Those who used the *plan vivo* plots to plant annual crops have witnessed an increase in agricultural production. Participants have started to get some firewood from dead tree branches while others are getting poles during thinning. Apart from being spent to better manage the tree farms, the

monetary incentives received by participants have been used to pay school fees for their children, to expand their farms and to contribute to development activities in their areas, such as the construction of a school.

Various trainings on entrepreneurship were conducted for Plan Vivo groups. Participants decided to start small enterprises according to their wish. Some started beekeeping, poultry keeping, goat keeping and gardening. Thanks to these small businesses, farmers are now earning some money for their daily consumption.

Part G: Payments for Ecosystem Services

Payment for this reporting period was done to qualified piloting participants (fourth instalment) and those who did not qualify last year. Last year 166 ongoing producers did not qualify, and their payments were withheld until they reached the required target. Out of those, 82 participants have now qualified[2]. The total of TSh 13,502,000 were paid to those participants as described on the table below.

Table G1: The payments made in 2015 were as follows:

Instalments	No of Participants	Amount paid (TSh)	Amount paid (USD)
2nd year	7	758,000	374
3rd year	75	12,473,000	6,151
4th year	4	271,000	134
Total	86	13,502,000	6,659

Table G2; the total amount paid to date.

S/No	Year	Amount (Tsh)	Amount (USD)
1	2011	1,848,600	1,294
2	2012	172,218,400	108,498
3	2013	107,967,000	64,605
4	2014	70,535,000	42,259
5	2015	13,502,000	6,659
Total		366,071,000	223,315

Exchange rate as of 30th April 2015 at http://www.oanda.com/

Detailed data on payments per participant is included in Appendix 2.

Part H: Ongoing community participation

Effective communication and consultation with the Plan Vivo groups is maintained through monthly group meetings whereby each group sets a date on which they meet with the project staff to discuss various issues related to the management of their farms. The monthly meetings are also used to discuss the establishment of development projects that would keep the communities together and that would improve their social bond by incorporating other economically useful activities. Training/ facilitations are done in groups.

[2] Some participants have more than one technical specification and have qualified at different times so appear in both reports (2013/2014 and 2014/2015). There are also 4 participants from the pilot project that have now qualified, bringing the total number of paid participants to 86 (see Table G1).

In addition, development activities that emerged from training sessions carried out in previous years were also followed up on during this reporting period. Farmers/ groups with enterprises have been visited to assess the progress of their activities and to provide them with additional advice when necessary. Most farmers have engaged in poultry keeping, beekeeping, tree nurseries and goat keeping. Finally, a follow up was also conducted on the use of fuel-efficient constructed stoves.

Table H1: Topics discussed

S/NO	TOPICS	CONTENT
1.	Sustainable Agriculture Land Management practices	Various practices like mulching, the construction of soil and water conservation structures for the purpose of managing soil fertility, soil moisture, and increase crop production are part of climate change adaptation.
2.	Environmental Education	Environmental conservation, climate change aspects, its negative impacts, and adaptation and mitigation measures
3.	How to address household food security in changing climate	How to improve agricultural yields in a changing climate through agroforestry and SLM practices, the use of improved seeds and drought tolerant crops
4.	Fire control measures	Making fire breaks along *plan vivo* plots, lobbying and advocacy for village bylaws regarding bush fire
5.	Sustainable energy	Construction and use of fuel-efficient stoves
6.	Proper handling of animal waste	Best methods of treating animal waste in order to obtain high quality manure and to reduce emissions from it

Part I: Project operating costs

Table I: Allocation of costs

Expense	Description	Cost per annum (US$)	Contribution from sales of Plan Vivo Certificates	Contribution from other income (e.g. grants)
Personnel	· 1 Coordinator · 3 Assistant Coordinators	30,121	-	0
Office/admin		5,217	-	0
Equipment		0	-	0
Travel		8,148	-	0
Fee		0	-	0
Audits		0	-	0
Additional exp		0	-	0
Training		5,360	-	0
Marketing		0	-	0
	TOTAL	48,846		**0**

Appendix 1: Monitoring results for piloting group (1-22) and participants that did not qualify last year

S/No	Year of monitoring (i.e. participants at year 1, 2, 3)	Name of producer/ producer ID/group ID[3]	Total tCO_2 services to be generated by plan vivo	Location e.g. A village name/project area/farmers' cooperative	Area (ha)	Technical specification	Monitoring target	Monitoring result
1	Year 4		64	Nyaishozi zone	0.454	Woodlot	DBH >/= 10 cm	11 cm
2	Year 4		136	Nyaishozi zone	0.969	Woodlot	DBH >/= 10cm	10 cm
3	Year 4		118	Nyaishozi zone	0.844	Woodlot	DBH >/= 10 cm	2 cm
4	Year 4		101	Nyaishozi zone	0.723	Woodlot	DBH >/= 10 cm	1 cm
5	Year 4		83	Nyaishozi zone	0.59	Woodlot	DBH >/= 10 cm	3 cm
6	Year 4		84	Nyaishozi zone	0.5991	Woodlot	DBH >/= 10 cm	4 cm
7	Year 4		138	Nyaishozi zone	0.984	Woodlot	DBH >/= 10 cm	6 cm
8	Year 4		85	Nyaishozi zone	0.606	Woodlot	DBH >/= 10 cm	7 cm
9	Year 4		84	Nyaishozi zone	0.603	Woodlot	DBH >/= 10 cm	0 cm
10	Year 4		91	Nyaishozi zone	0.647	Woodlot	DBH >/= 10 cm	5 cm
11	Year 4		35	Nyaishozi zone	0.253	Woodlot	DBH >/= 10 cm	10 cm
12	Year 4		70	Nyaishozi zone	0.5	Woodlot	DBH >/= 10 cm	3 cm
13	Year 4		65	Nyaishozi zone	0.984 85 m	D. Interplanting B. Planting	DBH >/= 10 cm	3 cm (DI) 8 cm (BP)
14	Year 4		86	Nyaishozi zone	0.616	Woodlot	DBH >/= 10 cm	1 cm
15	Year 4		80	Nyaishozi zone	0.574	Woodlot	DBH >/= 10 cm	5 cm
16	Year 4		133	Nyaishozi zone	0.9513	Woodlot	DBH >/= 10 cm	6 cm
17	Year 4		93	Nyaishozi zone	0.664	Woodlot	DBH >/= 10 cm	5 cm
18	Year 4		17	Nyaishozi zone	0.275	D. Interplanting	DBH >/= 10 cm	5 cm
19	Year 4		96	Nyaishozi zone	0.686 0.3888	D. Interplanting Woodlot	DBH >/= 10 cm	7 cm (DI) 1 cm (WD)
20	Year 4		122	Nyaishozi zone	0.874	Woodlot	DBH >/= 10 cm	7 cm

[3] Due to data protection regulations, the names of participants have been taken out of the public version of this report

21	Year 4	36	Nyaishozi zone	0.587	D. Interplanting	DBH >/= 10 cm	12 cm
22	Year 4	18	Nyaishozi zone	0.298	D. Interplanting	DBH >/= 10 cm	7 cm
23	Year 3	136	Nyaishozi zone	0.971	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	8%
24	Year 3	64	Nyaishozi zone	0.459	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	3%
25	Year 3	115	Nyaishozi zone	0.823	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	6%
26	Year 3	80	Nyaishozi zone	0.571	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	10%
27	Year 3	81	Nyaishozi zone	0.575	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	100%
28	Year 3	64	Nyaishozi zone	0.4545	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	100%
29	Year 3	60	Nyaishozi zone	0.428	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	16%
30	Year 3	98	Nyaishozi zone	0.6993	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	0%
31	Year 3	29	Nyaishozi zone	0.207	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	6%
32	Year 3	52	Nyaishozi zone	0.37	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	95%
33	Year 3	44	Nyaishozi zone	0.315	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	98%
34	Year 3	79	Nyaishozi zone	1410m	B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	11%
35	Year 3	80	Nyaishozi zone	1420	B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	100%
36	Year 3	249	Nyaishozi zone	1520	B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	98%
				1.168	Woodlot		100%
37	Year 3	41	Nyaishozi zone	0.2897	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	100%
38	Year 3	56	Nyaishozi zone	0.399	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	90%
39	Year 2	42	Nyaishozi zone	0.302	Woodlot	100% of plot est'd	1%
40	Year 2	56	Nyaishozi zone	0.4	Woodlot	100% of plot est'd	100%
41	Year 2	30	Nyaishozi zone	535 m	B. Planting	100% of plot est'd	15%
42	Year 3	27	Bugene zone	480m	B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	31%
43	Year 3	42	Bugene zone	0.3033	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	26%
44	Year 3	13	Bugene zone	0.0918	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	4%
45	Year 3	67	Bugene zone	0.3316	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	0%
46	Year 3	10	Bugene zone	176m	B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	0%
47	Year 3	79	Bugene zone	0.56419	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	0%
48	Year 3	24	Bugene zone	0.1715	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	0%
49	Year 3	33	Bugene zone	0.2348	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	0%
50	Year 3	19	Bugene zone	0.1358	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	0%
51	Year 3	68	Bugene zone	0.4862	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	98%

52	Year 3	55	Bugene zone	0.3934	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	34%
53	Year 3	30	Bugene zone	521 m	B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	44%
54	Year 3	14	Bugene zone	0.2299	D. Interplanting	Survival rate >/= 90%	93%
55	Year 3	25	Bugene zone	0.1787	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	97%
56	Year 3	51	Bugene zone	0.3677	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	1%
57	Year 3	63	Bugene zone	0.4498	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	99%
58	Year 3	14	Bugene zone	0.1006	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	7%
59	Year 3	16	Bugene zone	0.1123	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	100%
60	Year 3	14	Bugene zone	251m	B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	17%
61	Year 3	47	Bugene zone	0.3371	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	17%
62	Year 3	19	Bugene zone	344m	B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	9%
63	Year 3	41	Bugene zone	0.2052	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	0%
				213m	B. Planting		0%
64	Year 3	37	Bugene zone	0.2618	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	97%
65	Year 3	149	Bugene zone	1.0614	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	27%
66	Year 3	195	Bugene zone	1.3906	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	7%
67	Year 3	61	Bugene zone	0.4358	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	25%
68	Year 3	30	Kaisho zone	0.2143	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	58%
69	Year 3	31	Kaisho zone	557 m	B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	3%
80	Year 3	209	Kaisho zone	1.4885	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	0%
81	Year 3	112	Kaisho zone	0.8	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	99%
82	Year 3	22	Kaisho zone	0.36736	D. Interplanting	Survival rate >/= 90%	58%
83	Year 3	36	Kaisho zone	0.26046	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	1%
84	Year 2	61	Kaisho zone	0.43257	Woodlot	100% of plot est'd	100%
85	Year 3	59	Kaisho zone	0.9673	D. Interplanting	Survival rate >/= 90%	49%
86	Year 3	74	Kaisho zone	0.52518	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	98%
87	Year 3	24	Kaisho zone	0.39196	D. Interplanting	Survival rate >/= 90%	38%
88	Year 3	227	Kaisho zone	1.62243	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	0%
89	Year 3	34	Kaisho zone	0.24243	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	2%
90	Year 3	52	Kaisho zone	0.36959	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	99%
91	Year 3	56	Kaisho zone	0.92	D. Interplanting	Survival rate >/= 90%	53%
92	Year 3	53	Kaisho zone	0.37506	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	24%

93	Year 3	25	Kaisho zone	444m	B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	127%
94	Year 3	38	Kaisho zone	0.26933	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	100%
95	Year 2	17	Kaisho zone	0.28053	D. Interplanting	100% of plot est'd	46%
96	Year 3	77	Kaisho zone	0.54988	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	48%
97	Year 3	27	Kaisho zone	0.19	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	9%
98	Year 3	29	Kaisho zone	0.20885	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	23%
99	Year 3	52	Kaisho zone	0.85212	D. Interplanting	Survival rate >/= 90%	100%
100	Year 3	71	Kaisho zone	0.50455	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	3%
101	Year 3	112	Kaisho zone	0.8	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	18%
102	Year 3	22	Kaisho zone	0.36224	D. Interplanting	Survival rate >/= 90%	100%
103	Year 3	293	Kaisho zone	2.09492	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	23%
104	Year 3	69	Kaisho zone	0.49347	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	39%
105	Year 3	34	Kaisho zone	0.14894 0.22163	Woodlot D. Interplanting	Survival rate >/= 90%	9% 10%
106	Year 3	111	Kaisho zone	0.79397	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	95%
107	Year 3	25	Kaisho zone	0.40525	D. Interplanting	Survival rate >/= 90%	99%
108	Year 2	67	Kaisho zone	0.4807	Woodlot	100% of plot est'd	100%
109	Year 3	31	Kaisho zone	545m	B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	100%
110	Year 3	96	Kaisho zone	0.68902	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	0%
111	Year 3	18	Kaisho zone	0.12669	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	97%
112	Year 3	106	Kaisho zone	0.5301 569 m	Woodlot B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	1% 90%
113	Year 3	95	Kaisho zone	0.6794	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	53%
114	Year 2	104	Kaisho zone	0.212 0.4682 822 m	Woodlot D. Interplanting B. Planting	100% of plot established	100% 100% 26%
115	Year 3	63	Kaisho zone	0.45127	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	4%
116	Year 3	237	Kaisho zone	1.69499	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	3%
117	Year 3	19	Kaisho zone	343m	B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	93%
118	Year 3	57	Kaisho zone	0.40802	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	100%
119	Year 3	34	Kaisho zone	607m	B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	33%
120	Year 2	60	Kaisho zone	0.98894	D. Interplanting	100% of plot est'd	0%

121	Year 3	13	Kaisho zone	231m	B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	24%
122	Year 2	45	Kaisho zone	0.56543	D. Interplanting	100% of plot est'd	100%
				182m	B. Planting		58%
123	Year 3	30	Kaisho zone	0.49105	D. Interplanting	Survival rate >/= 90%	100%
124	Year 3	105	Kaisho zone	1.05003	D. Interplanting	Survival rate >/= 90%	0%
				725m	B. Planting		12%
125	Year 3	78	Kaisho zone	0.8587	D. Interplanting	Survival rate >/= 90%	92%
				458m	B. Planting		100%
126	Year 2	53	Kaisho zone	0.42473	D. Interplanting	100% of plot	100%
				481m	B. Planting	established	100%
127	Year 3	49	Kaisho zone	879m	B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	100%
128	Year 2	49	Kaisho zone	0.52345	D. Interplanting	100% of plot	99%
				308m	B. Planting	established	100%
129	Year 3	109	Kaisho zone	0.37294	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	17%
				0.48727	D. Interplanting		0%
				489m	B. Planting		100%
130	Year 3	27	Kaisho zone	484m	B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	88%
131	Year 3	78	Kaisho zone	0.55807	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	5%
132	Year 3	128	Kaisho zone	0.915	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	26%
133	Year 3	38	Kaisho zone	0.27251	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	42%
134	Year 3	23	Kaisho zone	403m	B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	36%
135	Year 3	42	Kaisho zone	0.69126	D. Interplanting	Survival rate >/= 90%	100%
136	Year 3	29	Kaisho zone	516m	B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	95%
137	Year 3	33	Kaisho zone	0.5396	D. Interplanting	Survival rate >/= 90%	47%
138	Year 3	35	Kaisho zone	0.25167	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	32%
139	Year 3	80	Kaisho zone	0.5689	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	0%
140	Year 3	40	Kaisho zone	0.28852	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	4%
141	Year 3	22	Kaisho zone	0.16033	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	100%
142	Year 3	25	Kaisho zone	0.27172	D. Interplanting	Survival rate >/= 90%	19%
				144m	B. Planting		8%
143	Year 3	58	Kaisho zone	0.4162	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	25%
144	Year 3	113	Kaisho zone	0.80751	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	99%

145	Year 3	51	Kaisho zone	0.36461	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	14%
146	Year 3	56	Kaisho zone	0.4007	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	10%
147	Year 3	13	Kaisho zone	0.21509	D. Interplanting	Survival rate >/= 90%	42%
148	Year 3	52	Kaisho zone	0.37067	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	100%
149	Year 3	87	Kaisho zone	0.6237	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	95%
150	Year 3	163	Kaisho zone	1.16604	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	59%
151	Year 3	42	Kaisho zone	0.30085	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	27%
152	Year 3	57	Kaisho zone	0.41036	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	27%
153	Year 3	43	Kaisho zone	0.3071	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	16%
154	Year 3	39	Kaisho zone	0.6371	D. Interplanting	Survival rate >/= 90%	94%
155	Year 3	98	Kaisho zone	0.7	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	100%
156	Year 3	185	Kaisho zone	0.56565	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	15%
				1.30553	D. Interplanting		11%
				466m	B. Planting		45%
157	Year 3	162	Kaisho zone	0.77497	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	18%
				0.54521	D. Interplanting		0%
				386m	B. Planting		0%
158	Year 3	75	Kaisho zone	0.42106	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	30%
				291m	B. Planting		64%
159	Year 3	28	Kaisho zone	0.20111	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	63%
160	Year 3	34	Kaisho zone	0.24162	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	20%
161	Year 3	27	Kaisho zone	0.43687	D. Interplanting	Survival rate >/= 90%	99%
162	Year 3	38	Kaisho zone	0.2689	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	99%
163	Year 3	289	Kaisho zone	2.06696	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	41%
164	Year 3	685	Kaisho zone	3.5342	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	100%
165	Year 3	41	Kaisho zone	0.29467	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	61%
166	Year 3	23	Kaisho zone	403m	B.Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	100%
167	Year 3	96	Kaisho zone	0.68876	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	1%
168	Year 3	91	Kaisho zone	1.1551	D. Interplanting	Survival rate >/= 90%	0%
				367m	B. Planting		14%
169	Year 3	16	Kaisho zone	277m	B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	9%
170	Year 3	38	Kaisho zone	686m	B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	30%

171	Year 3	729	Kaisho zone	4.8098	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	7%
				998m	B. Planting		0%
172	Year 3	27	Kaisho zone	480m	B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	27%
173	Year 3	46	Kaisho zone	0.3225	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	100%
174	Year 3	25	Kaisho zone	0.40734	D. Interplanting	Survival rate >/= 90%	15%
175	Year 3	43	Kaisho zone	775m	B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	100%
176	Year 3	114	Kaisho zone	0.81278	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	30%
177	Year 3	60	Kaisho zone	0.43081	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	100%
178	Year 3	44	Kaisho zone	0.07734	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	100%
				589m	B. Planting		100%
179	Year 3	33	Kaisho zone	0.23484	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	100%
180	Year 3	61	Kaisho zone	0.43297	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	93%
181	Year 3	158	Kaisho zone	1.12524	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	99%
182	Year 3	24	Kaisho zone	0.39227	D. Interplanting	Survival rate >/= 90%	100%
183	Year 3	15	Kaisho zone	266m	B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	44%
184	Year 3	16	Kaisho zone	282m	B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	30%
185	Year 3	72	Kaisho zone	0.51642	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	99%
186	Year 3	29	Kaisho zone	512m	B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	96%
187	Year 3	39	Kaisho zone	0.28067	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	98%
188	Year 3	128	Kaisho zone	0.91136	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	11%
189	Year 3	106	Kaisho zone	0.75903	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	0%
190	Year 3	14	Kaisho zone	252m	B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	100%
191	Year 3	107	Kaisho zone	0.76655	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	0%
192	Year 3	427	Kaisho zone	3.04818	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	6%
193	Year 3	532	Kaisho zone	3.57471	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	0%
				563m	B. Planting		0%
194	Year 3	115	Kaisho zone	0.82089	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	0%
195	Year 3	33	Kaisho zone	0.234	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	0%
196	Year 3	23	Kaisho zone	420m	B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	100%
197	Year 3	79	Kaisho zone	0.56657	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	24%
198	Year 3	26	Kaisho zone	0.07531	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	38%
				272m	B. Planting		43%

199	Year 3	33	Kaisho zone	584m	B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	10%
200	Year 3	73	Kaisho zone	0.743 233m	D. Interplanting B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	40% 6%
201	Year 3	430	Kaisho zone	2.7347 833m	Woodlot B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	0% 2%
202	Year 3	115	Kaisho zone	1.40837 515m	D. Interplanting B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	21% 100%
203	Year 3	119	Kaisho zone	1.42317 577m	D. Interplanting B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	12% 13%
204	Year 3	59	Kaisho zone	0.42375	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	99%
205	Year 3	22	Kaisho zone	0.36562	D. Interplanting	Survival rate >/= 90%	11%
206	Year 3	47	Kaisho zone	0.33597	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	29%
207	Year 3	124	Kaisho zone	0.8834	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	100%
208	Year 3	139	Kaisho zone	0.61997 0.85	Woodlot D. Interplanting	Survival rate >/= 90%	62% 41%
209	Year 3	79	Kaisho zone	0.42925 335m	Woodlot B .Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	99% 0%
210	Year 3	81	Kaisho zone	0.57722	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	97%
211	Year 3	63	Kaisho zone	0.45139	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	48%
212	Year 3	10	Kaisho zone	185m	Boundary Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	100%
213	Year 3	25	Kaisho zone	446m	B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	97%
214	Year 3	179	Kaisho zone	1.2784	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	98%
215	Year 3	129	Kaisho zone	0.736 461m	Woodlot B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	5% 7%
216	Year 3	158	Kaisho zone	1.1294	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	91%
217	Year 3	126	Kaisho zone	1.4268 697m	D. Interplanting B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	28% 17%
218	Year 3	78	Kaisho zone	0.4487 275m	Woodlot B. Planting	Survival rate >/= 90%	98% 100%
219	Year 3	511	Kaisho zone	3.6482	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	97%
220	Year 3	255	Kaisho zone	1.6094	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	98%

				527m	B. Planting		98%
221	Year 3	40	Kaisho zone	0.3956	D. Interplanting	Survival rate >/= 90%	100%
				280m	B. Planting		100%
222	Year 3	557	Kaisho zone	3.9813	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	100%
223	Year 3	117	Kaisho zone	0.6506	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	100%
				469m	B. Planting		100%
224	Year 3	215	Kaisho zone	1.5324	Woodlot	Survival rate >/= 90%	96%

Appendix 2: PES Payment

S/NO	PARTICIPANT[4]	LOCATION	PV ID	TECH SPEC	AMOUNT	REMARK
1		Nyaishozi	90	Woodlot	104,000.00	3rd payment
2		Nyaishozi	113	Woodlot	88,000.00	3rd payment
3		Nyaishozi	190	Boundary Planting	160,000.00	3rd payment
4		Nyaishozi	244	WD & BP	498,000.00	3rd payment
5		Nyaishozi	155	Woodlot	112,000.00	2nd payment
6		Nyaishozi	138	Woodlot	162,000.00	3rd payment
7		Nyaishozi	249	Woodlot	128,000.00	3rd payment
8		Nyaishozi	204	Woodlot	82,000.00	3rd payment
9		Nyaishozi	67	Woodlot	112,000.00	3rd payment
10		Nyaishozi	2	Woodlot	35,000.00	4th payment
11		Nyaishozi	14	Woodlot	136,000.00	4th payment
12		Nyaishozi	17	Woodlot	64,000.00	4th payment
13		Nyaishozi	18	D. Interplanting	36,000.00	4th payment
14		Bugene	167	Woodlot	136,000.00	3rd payment
15		Bugene	214	D. Interplanting	28,000.00	3rd payment
16		Bugene	222	Woodlot	50,000.00	3rd payment
17		Bugene	227	Woodlot	126,000.00	3rd payment
18		Bugene	323	Woodlot	32,000.00	3rd payment
19		Bugene	250	Woodlot	74,000.00	3rd payment
20		Kaisho	73	Woodlot	224,000.00	3rd payment
21		Kaisho	154	Woodlot	148,000.00	3rd payment
22		Kaisho	474	Woodlot	104,000.00	3rd payment
23		Kaisho	87	Woodlot	122,000.00	2nd payment
24		Kaisho	485	BP	50,000.00	3rd payment
25		Kaisho	104	Woodlot	76,000.00	3rd payment

[4] Due to data protection regulations, the names of participants have been taken out of the public version of this report

26	Kaisho	50	DI	104,000.00	3rd payment
27	Kaisho	72	DI	44,000.00	3rd payment
28	Kaisho	420	Woodlot	222,000.00	3rd payment
29	Kaisho	92	DI	50,000.00	3rd payment
30	Kaisho	144	Woodlot	134,000.00	2nd payment
31	Kaisho	160	BP	62,000.00	3rd payment
32	Kaisho	169	Woodlot	36,000.00	3rd payment
33	Kaisho	170	WD & BP	64,000.00	BP-3rd payment
34	Kaisho	173	WD, DI & BP	116,000.00	WD & DI - 2nd pay
35	Kaisho	182	BP	38,000.00	3rd payment
36	Kaisho	185	WD & BP	114,000.00	WD -3rd payment
37	Kaisho	192	DI & BP	70,000.00	DI- 2nd payment
38	Kaisho	455	DI & BP	156,000.00	3rd payment
39	Kaisho	456	DI & BP	106,000.00	2nd payment
40	Kaisho	487	BP	98,000.00	3rd payment
41	Kaisho	488	DI & BP	98,000.00	2nd payment
42	Kaisho	452	DI & BP	60,000.00	DI- 3rd payment
43	Kaisho	180	BP	54,000.00	3rd payment
44	Kaisho	218	WD, DI & BP	54,000.00	BP-3rd payment
45	Kaisho	232	DI	84,000.00	3rd payment
46	Kaisho	234	BP	58,000.00	3rd payment
47	Kaisho	247	Woodlot	44,000.00	3rd payment
48	Kaisho	257	Woodlot	226,000.00	3rd payment
49	Kaisho	279	Woodlot	104,000.00	3rd payment
50	Kaisho	296	Woodlot	174,000.00	3rd payment
51	Kaisho	307	DI	78,000.00	3rd payment
52	Kaisho	317	Woodlot	196,000.00	3rd payment
53	Kaisho	329	DI	54,000.00	3rd payment
54	Kaisho	331	Woodlot	76,000.00	3rd payment
55	Kaisho	335	Woodlot	990,000.00	3rd pay-for 2nd WD

56	Kaisho	346	BP	46,000.00	3rd payment
57	Kaisho	363	WD & BP	92,000.00	3rd pay – WD
58	Kaisho	370	WD & BP	86,000.00	3rd pay – BP
59	Kaisho	358	WD & BP	120,000.00	3rd pay – WD
60	Kaisho	366	WD, DI & BP	88,000.00	3rd pay - BP & WD
61	Kaisho	432	WD & BP	66,000.00	3rd pay – WD
62	Kaisho	374	Woodlot	122,000.00	3rd payment
63	Kaisho	375	Woodlot	316,000.00	3rd payment
64	Kaisho	377	DI	48,000.00	3rd payment
65	Kaisho	387	Woodlot	144,000.00	3rd payment
66	Kaisho	389	BP	58,000.00	3rd payment
67	Kaisho	392	Woodlot	78,000.00	3rd payment
68	Kaisho	399	WD & BP	28,000.00	3rd payment BP
69	Kaisho	444	WD & BP	46,000.00	3rd payment BP
70	Kaisho	410	WD, DI & BP	58,000.00	3rd payment BP
71	Kaisho	413	Woodlot	118,000.00	3rd payment
72	Kaisho	428	Woodlot	248,000.00	3rd payment
73	Kaisho	438	WD & BP	120,000.00	3rd payment WD
74	Kaisho	446	Woodlot	162,000.00	3rd payment
75	Kaisho	459	BP	20,000.00	3rd payment
76	Kaisho	489	BP	50,000.00	3rd payment
77	Kaisho	490	WD & BP	358,000.00	3rd payment – WD
78	Kaisho	493	Woodlot	316,000.00	3rd payment
79	Kaisho	498	WD & BP	156,000.00	3rd payment
80	Kaisho	369	Woodlot	1,022,000.00	3rd payment
81	Kaisho	364	WD & BP	510,000.00	3rd payment
82	Kaisho	318	Woodlot	517,000.00	3rd payment
83	Kaisho	491	DI & BP	80,000.00	3rd payment
84	Kaisho	300	Woodlot	1,114,000.00	3rd payment
85	Kaisho	52	WD & BP	234,000.00	3rd payment

86	Kaisho	407	Woodlot	430,000.00	3rd payment
	Total payment			**13,502,000.00**	

Appendix 3. List of participants deleted from the project

S/N	PARTICIPANT[5]	PV ID	LOCATION	TECH SPEC	EX tC
1		121	Nyaishozi	Woodlot	
2		133	Nyaishozi	Woodlot	
3		131	Nyaishozi	Woodlot	
4		119	Nyaishozi	Woodlot	
5		141	Nyaishozi	Woodlot	
6		179	Nyaishozi	Woodlot	
7		72	Nyaishozi	Woodlot	
8		53	Nyaishozi	Boundary Planting	
9		228	Nyaishozi	Woodlot	
10		9	Nyaishozi	Woodlot	
11		27	Bugene	Boundary Planting	
12		46	Bugene	Woodlot	
13		84	Bugene	Woodlot	
14		96	Bugene	Woodlot & BP	
15		106	Bugene	Woodlot	
16		134	Bugene	Woodlot	
17		135	Bugene	Woodlot	
18		139	Bugene	Woodlot	
19		140	Bugene	Woodlot	
20		173	Bugene	Woodlot	
21		172	Bugene	Boundary Planting	
22		226	Bugene	Woodlot	
23		223	Bugene	Woodlot	
24		239	Bugene	Woodlot	
25		257	Bugene	Woodlot	
26		309	Bugene	Boundary Planting	
27		367	Bugene	WD & BP	
28		118	Bugene	Woodlot	
29		32	Kaisho	Woodlot	
30		47	Kaisho	Woodlot & BP	
31		83	Kaisho	D. Inter-planting	
32		86	Kaisho	Woodlot	
33		151	Kaisho	D. Inter-planting	
34		156	Kaisho	D. Inter-planting	
35		157	Kaisho	Woodlot	
36		158	Kaisho	Woodlot	
37		476	Kaisho	D. Inter-planting	
38		483	Kaisho	Woodlot	
39		28	Kaisho	D. Inter-planting	

[5] Due to data protection regulations, the names of participants have been taken out of the publ this report

40	134	Kaisho	Woodlot	77
41	37	Kaisho	Woodlot	27
42	94	Kaisho	Woodlot	54
43	49	Kaisho	Woodlot	29
44	66	Kaisho	Woodlot	71
45	68	Kaisho	Woodlot	112
46	93	Kaisho	Woodlot	293
47	119	Kaisho	Woodlot	69
48	130	Kaisho	Woodlot & DI	34
49	115	Kaisho	D. Inter-planting	20
50	165	Kaisho	Woodlot	96
51	178	Kaisho	Woodlot	237
52	186	Kaisho	Boundary Planting	34
53	190	Kaisho	Boundary Planting	13
54	454	Kaisho	DI & BP	105
55	203	Kaisho	Woodlot	78
56	198	Kaisho	Woodlot	128
57	223	Kaisho	Woodlot	38
58	231	Kaisho	Boundary Planting	23
59	239	Kaisho	D. Inter-planting	33
60	241	Kaisho	Woodlot	35
61	244	Kaisho	Woodlot	80
62	245	Kaisho	Woodlot	40
63	253	Kaisho	DI & BP	25
64	254	Kaisho	Woodlot	58
65	481	Kaisho	Woodlot	51
66	486	Kaisho	Woodlot	56
67	274	Kaisho	D. Inter-planting	13
68	271	Kaisho	Woodlot	294
69	284	Kaisho	Woodlot	44
70	299	Kaisho	Woodlot	163
71	301	Kaisho	Woodlot	42
72	302	Kaisho	Woodlot	57
73	303	Kaisho	Woodlot	43
74	322	Kaisho	WD, DI & BP	185
75	324	Kaisho	WD, DI & BP	162
76	447	Kaisho	WD & BP	75
77	447	Kaisho	Woodlot	28
78	423	Kaisho	Woodlot	34
79	327	Kaisho	Woodlot	289
80	340	Kaisho	Woodlot	41
81	348	Kaisho	Woodlot	96
82	349	Kaisho	BP & DI	91
83	351	Kaisho	Boundary Planting	16
84	355	Kaisho	Boundary Planting	38

85	356	Kaisho	WD & BP	729
86	362	Kaisho	Boundary Planting	27
87	367	Kaisho	D. Inter-planting	25
88	464	Kaisho	Woodlot	114
89	382	Kaisho	Boundary Planting	15
90	383	Kaisho	Boundary Planting	16
91	395	Kaisho	Woodlot	128
92	397	Kaisho	Woodlot	106
90	403	Kaisho	Woodlot	107
94	405	Kaisho	Woodlot	427
95	425	Kaisho	Woodlot & BP	532
96	424	Kaisho	Woodlot	115
97	433	Kaisho	Woodlot	33
98	460	Kaisho	Woodlot	79
99	462	Kaisho	Woodlot & BP	26
100	409	Kaisho	DI & BP	73
101	410	Kaisho	WD & BP	430
102	412	Kaisho	DI & BP	119
103	415	Kaisho	D. Inter-planting	22
104	418	Kaisho	Woodlot	47
105	434	Kaisho	WD & DI	139
106	457	Kaisho	Woodlot	63
107	492	Kaisho	WD & BP	129
108	494	Kaisho	DI & BP	126
		Total		**9,686**

The following have dropped one technical specification

S/N	PARTICIPANT[6]	PV ID	LOCATION	TECH SPEC	EXP tCO2
1		162	Nyaishozi	Woodlot	98
2		106	Nyaishozi	Boundary Planting	79
3		115	Bugene	Boundary Planting	10
4		248	Bugene	Boundary Planting	14
5		170	Kaisho	Woodlot	74
6		172	Kaisho	Woodlot	95
7		173	Kaisho	Boundary Planting	46
8		176	Kaisho	Woodlot	63
9		188	Kaisho	D. Inter-planting	60
10		192	Kaisho	Boundary Planting	10
11		218	Kaisho	DI & WD	82
12		388	Kaisho	Boundary Planting	33
13		411	Kaisho	DI	86

[6] Due to data protection regulations, the names of participants have been taken out of the public version of this report

14	438	Kaisho	Boundary Planting	19
		Total		**769**