

THE ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION TRUST OF UGANDA



Trees for Global Benefits (TGB) Program in Uganda

A Plan Vivo Project Annual Report

November 2008

Acknowledgements

The project would like to extend grateful to a number of individuals and institutions that have contributed to its positive development during the reporting period. This has been made possible by the generous support of all the respective partners and these include but not limited to the following

- Producers in the districts of Bushenyi, Hoima and Masindi,
- The Plan Vivo Foundation, whose continued guidance is greatly appreciated
- Buyers and Resellers of the credits produced by the project,
- Donors mainly USAID, who have made the project afford services that the carbon sales would not have been able to cover
- The Consultants who have provided the technical assistance,
- Third party verifiers, Rainforest Alliance
- ECOTRUST staff who have worked tirelessly sometimes into the wee hours of the night to ensure the smooth running of the project.

1. Key Events, Developments and Challenges

1.0 Key Events, Developments and Challenges

1.1 Key Events

The project has not experienced any significant environmental challenges during this reporting period. Generally the weather has been good throughout the year with ample rains. No incidences of drought or any other environmental hazards were reported. From the project development point of view, the project has enjoyed key events as detailed below:

1.1.1 Rwanda Government Delegation

Visit by a high profile delegation of the Rwandese government that included the minister of environment for the Rwandese government, the Rwandese ambassador to Uganda, director general of Rwandese forest services and senior forest technicians,

1.1.2 Study tour by the Clinton Hunter Development Initiative (CHDI)

The team included technicians from Rwanda. The CHDI has registered with the Plan Vivo Foundation and intends to use the Plan Vivo methodologies in their project. Therefore, the visit was of importance to the CHDI team in order that they acquaint themselves of the Plan Vivo project and its operation in Uganda. The Bushenyi producers in the project also benefited by getting an opportunity to show-case their work and as such were greatly motivated by the whole exercise.

1.1.3 Other visits

Furthermore, the project has received a number of consultants examining ways of how lessons learnt from the project will be extended to other communities/countries. These included consultants from ICEIDA, ECCM and DFID.

1.1.4 Workshops

The project has been presented in a number of workshops as an example of a successful community carbon offset scheme. These included workshops in the United Kingdom University of Edinburgh, and Imperial College London. Other workshops included the Africa Carbon Forum in Dakar, Senegal where the Programme Officer made a presentation on Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF)-Lessons for Africa as well as the CASCADe training workshop in Senegal, Dakar where the Executive

Director made a presentation by teleconference. The programme officer also participated in the Katoomba group meeting in Dar es salaam, Tanzania

1.2 Key Developments

1.2.1 Third Party Verification

The first third party verification of The Trees for Global Benefits Project (TGBP) has been conducted during October 2008 by Rain Forest Alliance/Smartwood Programme. The Rainforest Alliance team consisted of Jeffrey Hayward (team leader), Joseph William Osei, Julianne Baroody (an observer) and a Robert Esimu (local auditor). The team carried out various assignments including field visit to carbon producers in Bushenyi, interviewing stakeholders who included the local banks (Farmer recipient banks), carbon producers, sub-county carbon coordinators, Local council 1 leaders, District councilors, local NGOs. In addition, they carried out desk audits (document verification and database analysis) as well as talking to other stakeholders within Kampala including the ECOTRUST board of directors and companies such as the Uganda Carbon bureau.

1.2.2 The Community Carbon Fund.

After discussion with the Plan Vivo Foundation it was agreed that a Community Carbon Fund (CCF) be established. The CCF would consist of 10% of the total producer share and it will be administered by ECOTRUST. The carbon producers (individually or in a group) will be required to make a request for support whenever need arises following agreed upon procedures in the CCF guidelines. The CCF has been set aside for several purposes including capacity building, community development projects, as well as support to any producer(s) who faces a natural disaster/calamity for the purpose of re-establishing a destroyed carbon farm among many others.

1.2.3 Technical specification for fruit trees for Hoima and Masindi

The project has developed draft technical specifications for fruit trees for Hoima and Masindi which have been submitted to the Plan Vivo Foundation for external review. Some of the producers have started planting the fruit trees using the newly prepared specifications and will be used during the quantification of their carbon in the farms.

1.2.4 Field Offices

In order to improve on the effective management of field activities, ECOTRUST has established new offices and a project officer in the new districts of Masindi and Hoima. The office is located in Masindi town and is headed by Marcellinus Bbale.

1.2.6 Project Surveys

Two surveys have been conducted during this reporting period and these are; a socio economic assessment as well as preliminary assessment of the impact of carbon finance on attitudes towards conservation. The latter is part of a PhD study by Janet Fischer, a student from the University of East Anglia. The socio-economic study is being conducted in collaboration with the Plan Vivo Foundation, by its lead researcher, Sarah Carter, and it is intended to establish the impact of the project on the livelihoods of participating communities.

1.2.7 New Price Structure

The project has increased the price per tCO₂ to cater for the cost of verification and contribution to the Community Carbon Fund.

1.3 Challenges during implementation of the programme

The main challenges during this reporting period included the following :

1.3.1 Training Needs

Producers especially from the old groups have continued to request for more training in various areas of tree management. The Carbon Community Fund has been put in place to support such requests. However, it is currently not yet fully operational pending the endorsement of the guidelines by ECOTRUST board of Trustees. The project is expected to be able to address this challenge at the beginning of next year.

1.3.2 Cost of Seedlings

The cost of seedlings continues to be a limiting factor for most of the producers and this is mainly because there are not many nurseries with indigenous tree species, and those that have them incur high expenses since these take a long time in the nurseries. The project has tried to address this challenge by supporting nursery operators within the groups. The nursery operators have been able to receive 60% advance payment before supplying the seedlings and the other 40% upon delivery of the correct quantities to the producers. Furthermore, with funding from USAID/PRIME-West the new groups in Hoima and Masindi received practical training in commercial nursery establishment and management.

1.3.3 Equipment:

Despite communities being advised on better pruning equipment, they are still reluctant to buy them. In some instances the carbon producers have pruned using wrong techniques that they have been advised against. Others are continuing to prune trees which are supposed to be self pruning and damaging them in the process. The carbon producers are still being encouraged to mobilize resources amongst themselves to buy a few of these pruning saws so that they can share.

1.3.4 Global Financial Crisis

The project's activities have been affected by the current global financial crisis, especially with regards to the purchases in UK Sterling. This is mainly because the Pound to Dollar rate has fallen a great deal between the time of purchase and time of transfer of funds to the Project Account. Since producers' agreements are signed as soon as the purchase has been confirmed, the project has been using the rate at the date of confirmation of the purchase. Furthermore, the pricing structure got distorted as the GBP exchange rate that was used at the time of setting the structure was grossly distorted. The purchases made in GBP could not meet the expected US\$ equivalent. In future, the project will have a uniform currency, whoever pays in a different currency will have to use the prevailing rate at the time of payment.

1.3.5 Death of carbon producers

ECOTRUST learnt with deep shock the sudden death of two of our carbon producers. These are: 1. Saba Mujuni who died after a very short illness. He is reported to have suffered a heart attack. 2. Rutembererwa Joverina who was struck by lightning and died instantly. This incident occurred very recently after the October/November 2008 monitoring. ***May their Souls rest in eternal peace!*** The respective coordinators are currently holding discussions with the family to identify contact persons for the project.

1.3.5 Field Coordinators

The number of producers in the field and therefore the amount of work for producer training, monitoring and mobilization has greatly increased. This has been compounded further by increased interest in expanding the programme to other parts of the country, stretching ECOTRUST's resources to the limit. The project is currently working with interns to work as project field assistants on a part time basis. In addition, the project has also engaged an intern to assist in the filing and organizing the project documents.

2. Activities

2.0 Activities

The producers have continued to follow their approved *plan vivos* for the different activities they are undertaking. The main land use systems continue to include agroforestry, boundary planting and woodlots of mixed native species. The main producer management objective is timber production. However, some producers are planting multipurpose trees such as *Prunus Africana* (with anti cancer properties used in the treatment of prostate cancer) and *Warburgia* sp (whose bark has anti malarial properties). In addition, producers are being advised to intercrop with suitable crops so they can maximize their output per unit area. While others are being encouraged to introduce bee farming as one of the short term income in this project.

3. Sales

3.0 Sales

This reporting period has registered a record number of sales since the beginning of the project. The Plan Vivo Foundation has been very instrumental in introducing the project to new buyers through its registration of resellers. Furthermore, the project has continued to sell credits to its long term buyers Tetra Pak and U&W. A total of 80,428.3tCO₂ have been purchased this reporting period, which is more than the entire cumulative amount for all purchases that the project has made since inception to 2007. In addition, the project has registered improved purchase prices and this has made third party verification as well as creation of a carbon community fund possible. Table 1 below shows the project sales since 2003 to 2007 whereas Table 2 shows the sales for 2008.

Table1: Carbon sales 2003 to 2007

Year	Buyer	tCO ₂	Price C02*	Tt cost \$*	EC/T share*	Producer share*	BR&D share*
2003	Tpk2003	11200					
2005	Tpk2004	9222					
2005	INASP1	102					
2005	One World	3.65					
2005	Future Forest	10000					
2006	Tpk2005	10933					
2006	INASP2	133.29					
2006	U&W1	22					
2006	Key Travel	24					
2006	Save Children	3.06					
2006	In-2 technology	21.27					
2006	U&W2	2550					
2007	Tpk2006	5000					
2007	U&W3	5625					
2007	In-2 technology	22					
2007	Rob Harley	10					
2007	U&W	265					
2007	U&W	2744					
2007	Sandra Hughes	50					
		57930.27		258963.2896	73773.185036	145854.694564	39316.91

* Individual price information has been blanked out on the public version of this report to protect contract confidentiality

Table 2: Carbon sales for 2008

Buyer	tCO2	Price per tCO2*		Total price*		Verification*		ECOTRUST*		Producer*				BR&D*		
										Individual		CCF				
		US\$	UKP	US\$	UKP	US\$	UKP	US\$	UKP	US\$	UKP	US\$	UKP	US\$	UKP	
Camco	40000															
Tpk2007	21000															
U&W	11266															
U&W	2786															
U&W	2062															
U&W	1155															
U\$W	1001															
Live Climate	250															
It's the Planet	600															
In-2 technology	23															
Pam friend	17															
Sarah Hughes	54.3															
Steffie Broer	40															
Gloria Kirabo	1															
INASP	168															
Tapani Vainio	5															
	80428.3			347280	40753	34728	4075	98975	11615	176760.6	20914	19640	2323.8	99.5715	1825.25	

Key

CCF = Carbon Community Fund

* Individual price information has been blanked out on the public version of this report to protect contract confidentiality

4. Allocation of Sales to Producers

The project has continued to allocate sales to producers based on a first come first served basis as well as progress as far as the project requirements including planned activities. A distribution of the available purchases has been made to the different sites proportionate to the number of producers that have met the project requirements. Currently the project has eight (8) producer groups and each of the groups has producers that have been allocated sales. Currently all the producers that applied before 2007 and have met the requirements have been allocated buyers. Those that are yet to meet the target will be given priority in the next reporting period if they fulfil the project requirements. The producers who qualify are allocated to different buyers randomly leading to different rates for the producers' carbon. Some of the producers have requested for an explanation as to why the same amount of carbon has a different price from one producer to another. Explanations regarding this issue have been repeatedly explained during the carbon producer meetings. During the allocation to carbon producers, the buyers whose CO₂ is small is bundled together for allocation to a producer producing an equivalent of the amalgamated quantity.

Table 3: Total Number of Producers allocated to Buyers Annually

Year of Allocation	Number of producers allocated to buyer
2003	30
2004	54
2006	18
2007	36
2008	207
Total	345

5. Participation and Recruitment

The project has continued to receive applications from the old (Bushenyi) and new (Hoima and Masindi) project sites. The producer coordinators as well as project staff have conducted meetings and sites visits assessing the new producer's readiness to join the project. A total of 345 producers have registered sale agreements since project inception. For this reporting period a total of 400 producers (Bushenyi, Hoima and Masindi) have applied to join the programme. Out of these 207 (Bushenyi 173, Hoima 15 and Masindi 19) have been allocated buyers. These producers represent a total of 395ha that has been recruited by the project in the current reporting period. The process of the applicant from application to being allocated a buyer is extensive and involves verifying the land tenure status and correctness of the submitted *plan vivo*. Priority for registration of sale agreements is given to those producers that demonstrated commitment to planting the minimum requirement (at least 50% planting) for the producer to be paid 30% of the saleable carbon value. Awareness meetings to orientate and enable the new communities have been done. This has been made possible by the presence of a full time project officer on site who gives regular technical training to the potential carbon producers. There are producers who would prefer to plant the mixed natives. This has been catered for initially by using the already prepared technical specification for Bushenyi area which basically involves using mixed native and pure address issues such as refresher training, group extension services targeting management of pests and diseases, disaster preparedness and other issues that may affect the groups. Table 4 below indicates the total number of new producers with registered sale agreements and their respective buyers for the reporting period.

Table 4: New Producers and Hectares Allocated to Each Respective Buyer in Each of the Districts during the reporting period

Buyer	Sale (tCO2)	Buyer Price*	Producers Description			Price to producer (\$)	Monitored? (Y/N)	Payment due
			Location	Number	Area (ha)			
Tetra Pak	21000		Bushenyi,	19596	96.34	3.39	Y	Jan 2009
			Hoima	896	4.4	3.39	Y	Jan 2009
			Masindi	508	2.5	3.39	Y	Jan 2009
U&W	6003		Hoima	3890.07	18.5	3.698	Y	Jan 2009
	12267		Bushenyi	14380.38	70.7	2.65	Y	Jan 2009
Camco	40000		Bushenyi,	36135.4	178	3.39	Y	Jan 2009
			Hoima	3864.6	19	3.39	Y	Jan 2009

Live Climate	250		Bushenyi	250	0.63	5.235	Y	Jan 2009
It's the Planet	600		Bushenyi	600	2.95	4.128	Y	Jan 2009
Minna's Dad	5		Bushenyi	5	0.025	4.128		Jan 2009
Inasp	168		Bushenyi	168	0.83	5.9	Y	Jan 2009
In 2 Technology	23		Bushenyi	23	0.11	4.128	Y	Jan 2009
Sarah Hughes	54.3		Hoima	54.3	0.27	4.77	Y	Jan 2009
Pam Friend	17		Hoima	17	0.08	4.396	Y	Jan 2009
Gloria Kirabo	1		Hoima	1	0.005	6.25	Y	Jan 2009
Steffie Broer	40		Hoima	40	0.2	4.128	Y	Jan 2009
Total	80428.3			80428.75	394.54			

* Buyer prices have been deleted from the public version of this report to observe confidentiality

6. Summary of Monitoring Results

11.0 Summary of Monitoring Results

Monitoring is a continuous process and in this project it is mandatory to ensure that producers are meeting their targets as stated in the sale agreement. It is the monitoring exercise that triggers payment. The project now in its fifth year, has started measuring the tree growth using DBH as indicated in the monitoring plan (where before targets were based on establishment and survival).

The two producers (Kantereine Fabious and Sinta Silver) who failed to meet their corrective actions during the previous reporting period have been able to do so in this reporting period. The requirements as in their agreements have been achieved (85%). However, these producers had been paid twice (i.e Year 0 and Year 1) therefore, we will wait to pay them until the trees reach the desired stage (an equivalent of 3 years). Table 5 below summarizes the above scenario before and after the corrective actions.

Table 5: Performance of Producers who had corrective Action last Reporting Period

Name ¹	Total Expected number of trees	Number counted
	500	470

¹ Due to data protection rules, the names of participants have been removed from the public version of this report

	400	347
--	-----	-----

During this reporting period, two monitoring visits were done, one during the month of April and another in October/November 2008. In addition, the producers were also visited during the audit process. For the month of April, the project concentrated on monitoring producers in year 2, who are expected to have planted all their targeted number of trees. Table 6 below shows details of the monitoring results for April 2008 and how the producers have responded to the corrective actions. In October and November the project monitored the producers in year2 with corrective action as well as those producers in year3 (expected to have at least 80% tree survival) and year 5 (expected to have an average DBH of 10cm). Table 7 presents the monitoring results for producers in year3 while table 8 gives results for those in year5.

Table 6: Year 2 Producers' Response to Corrective Action

Name ²	No of trees surviving	Expected target	Corrective action/ Balance to plant	Progress by October Monitoring
Bitereko Subcounty				
	336	400	64	completed
	382	1000	618	completed
	220	400	180	completed
	360	400	40	completed
	347	400	53	20 more trees to plant
	208	400	192	50 more trees to plant
	272	400	128	completed
	200	400	200	completed
	310	700	390	completed
	220	400	180	completed
	400	700	300	100 more trees to plant
Kiyanga Subcounty	190	600	410	completed
	225	401	176	completed
	200	400	200	50 more trees to plant
	800	1190	390	completed
	130	400	270	200 more trees to plant

Table 7: Monitoring Results of Year 3 Producers (Milestone of at least 85% tree survival)

Name ³	Expected number of trees	Observed number of surviving trees
Bunyaruguru-Pyt Yr1 (Bunyaruguru Development Association Ltd)		
	1700	1730

^{2/3} Due to data protection rules, the names of participants have been removed from the public version of this report

	425	421
	425	500
	510	600
	2550	2730
	3400	3340
	510	550
	340	347
	1700	2000
	11560	12218

Kiyanga-Yr1 (Kiyanga Coop. Saving and Credit Society)

	1360	1011
	518.5	610
	340	236
	2360.45	2479
	566.1	450
	944.35	550
	510	411
	340	400
	1530	1706
	8469.4	7853

Bitereko-Yr1(Bitereko Peoples Coop. Savings and Credit)

	471.75	459
	944.35	537
	944.35	770
	754.8	888
	944.35	803
	944.35	850
	471.75	300
	471.75	350
	944.35	1111
	471.75	360
	471.75	200
	471.75	200
	589.9	563
	826.2	663
	1179.8	975
	944.35	800
	944.35	600
	471.75	555
	944.35	850
	1179.8	1388
	1143.25	1345
	589.9	500
	17120.7	15067

Results in the above table indicate that almost all the producers in Bunyaruguru have the expected number of trees surviving. However, the tree for producers in Kiyanga and Bitereko are not performing as

well as those in Bunyaruguru. Each of the producers in Kiyanga and Bitereko has on average 68 and 93 trees respectively less the number expected to be surviving. The producers with less trees have been requested to replant some of the trees that did not survive.

Monitoring producers in year 5

This year (2008) was the first time to monitor carbon producers in year 5 whose milestone is an average DBH for the surviving trees. This was a new challenge for the project as it was the first time the project was measuring the rate of growth of the trees (in terms of dbh and tree height).

Monitoring methodology

The Diameter at Breast Height (DBH i.e. 1.3metres) above the ground level was measured using a distance tape and the Height of the trees from the ground to the tip was measured using the stick/halving method. This was done for every producer who is due for payment for year 5. Data was recorded from 3 established sample plots (of 15metre radius) in every garden. Ten trees in every plot were measured.

In order to measure the tree parameters, the team established sample plots diagonally on the producer's plots. The plots were established as follows: the first was in the left hand corner, the second in the center and the last in the Right hand corner of the producers' garden. In some gardens we used stratified sampling in order to get an average diameter of the trees planted. This is because some trees were bigger in some areas of the garden and others small. In addition, the sampling technique was dictated by the shape of the garden.

In a plot which is 1ha with an effective tree population of 400, 30 trees were measured. Therefore the fraction measured would be roughly 1/10. Homogeneity and heterogeneity (in terms of DBH and heights of trees) was also considered in the producers gardens where the trees were of different sizes especially brought about by replanting due to mortality.

Table 8: Monitoring Results of Year 5 Producers (Milestone of average tree DBH at least 10cm)

Bitereko ⁴	Target No. of trees	Observed average DBH	Monitoring target- average DBH	Status
	322	12.58	9	10 Qualified
	1000		10.7	Not Qualified due to insufficient number of trees
	1200		12	10 Qualified
	400		10	Qualified
	240		8.6	Not Qualified due to insufficient number of trees
	1300		11.15	10 Qualified
	175		10	Not Qualified due to insufficient number of trees
	400		12.45	10 Qualified
			10	Qualified
	399	10	10	Qualified
	300		9.97	Not Qualified due to insufficient number of trees
	110		20	10 Qualified
	100		11.3	10 Qualified
	1700	12	10	Qualified
	113		10	Not Qualified due to insufficient

⁴ Due to data protection rules, the names of participants have been removed from the public version of this report

				number of trees
	150	14.9	10	Not Qualified due to insufficient number of trees
	200		10	Qualified
	150		10	Not Qualified due to insufficient number of trees
	1600	10.03	10	Qualified
	200	12.8	10	Qualified
	300	14.04	10	Qualified
	400	12.25	10	Qualified
	100	10.1	10	Qualified
	300	11.34	10	Qualified

The majority of the producers have an average DBH above the minimum of 10cm. However, there are some (seven out of a total number of 25 monitored producers) producers who even though they have achieved the minimum required average DBH, the number of trees on their land is still less than the required 85% survival rate. These producers were considered not to have met their target and were therefore not recommended for payment and were requested to plant the missing trees.

N.B: For agroforestry and woodlot there is variability in growth rate due to spatial factors e.g. soils, valleys, hills etc.

7. Payments to Producers

The table below is a summary of payments that has been made to producers since the inception of the project. The table also indicates the amount of money each of these producers has received and how much the balance is.

Table 9: Payment to producers

Name ⁵	I.D no.	Site	90% C	yr0-30%	yr1-20%	yr3-20%	Tt-recv	Balance
402/19/051		Kiyanga	172.386	517.158			517.158	1206.702
402/02/005		Bitereko	56.52	135.648	90.432	90.432	316.512	135.648
402/02/005b		Bitereko	141.3	423.9			423.9	989.1
402/16/011		Bunyarguru	52.5636	126.15264	84.10176	84.10176	294.35616	126.15264
402/28/027		Bunyarguru	84.78	203.472			203.472	474.768
402/02/038		Bitereko	84.78	254.34			254.34	593.46
402/02/065		Bitereko	98.0622	294.1866	196.1244		490.311	490.311
402/28/017		Bunyarguru	70.65	169.56	113.04		282.6	282.6
402/28/034		Bunyarguru	113.04	339.12			339.12	791.28
402/16/004		Kichwamba	56.3787	135.30888	90.20592	90.20592	315.72072	135.30888
402/19/012		Kiyanga	56.6613	169.9839	113.3226		283.3065	283.3065
402/19/041		Kiyanga	56.52	169.56	113.04		282.6	282.6
402/02/011		Bitereko	78.4215	235.2645	156.843		392.1075	392.1075
402/16/016		Kichwamba	28.26	67.824	45.216	45.216	158.256	67.824
402/02/085		Bitereko	211.95	635.85			635.85	1483.65
402/02/059		Bitereko	156.9843	470.9529	313.9686		784.9215	784.9215
402/19/047		Kiyanga	186.7986	560.3958			560.3958	1307.5902
402/02/025		Bitereko	56.52	169.56	113.04		282.6	282.6
402/19/028		Kiyanga	84.78	254.34	169.56		423.9	423.9
402/19/010		Kiyanga	113.04	339.12	226.08		565.2	565.2
402/19/057		Kiyanga	56.52	169.56	113.04		282.6	282.6
402/02/051		Bitereko	78.4215	235.2645	156.843		392.1075	392.1075
402/02/032		Bitereko	56.52	169.56	113.04		282.6	282.6
402/19/050		Kiyanga	74.889	179.7336	119.8224		299.556	299.556
402/19/007		Kiyanga	392.3901	941.73624	627.82416		1569.5604	1569.5604
402/02/079		Bitereko	56.52	169.56	113.04		282.6	282.6
402/02/012		Bitereko	156.9843	470.9529	313.9686		784.9215	784.9215
402/28/003		Ryeru	28.26	67.824	45.216	45.216	158.256	67.824
402/16/020		Bunyarguru	145.1151	348.27624	232.18416		580.4604	580.4604
402/16/012		Kichwamba	240.21	576.504	384.336	384.336	1345.176	576.504
402/02/015		Bitereko	56.52	169.56	113.04		282.6	282.6
402/02/014		Bitereko	125.4744	301.13856	200.75904		501.8976	501.8976
402/19/020		Kiyanga	94.1058	225.85392	150.56928		376.4232	376.4232

⁵ Due to data protection rules, the names of participants have been removed from the public version of this report

	402/16/005	Kichwamba	42.39	101.736	67.824	67.824	237.384	101.736
	402/19/058	Kiyanga	155.43	466.29			466.29	1088.01
	402/28/008	Ryeru	14.13	33.912	22.608	22.608	79.128	33.912
	402/19/003	Kiyanga	113.04	271.296	180.864	180.864	633.024	271.296
	402/02/077	Bitereko	141.3	423.9			423.9	989.1
	402/19/002a	Kiyanga	183.69	440.856	293.904	293.904	1028.664	440.856
	402/19/002b	Bitereko	296.73	890.19	593.46		1483.65	1483.65
	402/19/002	Kiyanga	310.86	932.58			932.58	2176.02
	402/19/051	Kiyanga	84.78	203.472	135.648		339.12	339.12
	402/16/017	Kichwamba	21.195	50.868	33.912	33.912	118.692	50.868
	402/02/073	Bitereko	141.3	423.9			423.9	989.1
	402/28/021	Bunyarguru	84.78	203.472	135.648		339.12	339.12
	402/02/092	Bitereko	84.78	254.34			254.34	593.46
	402/16/008	Kichwamba	15.543	37.3032	24.8688	24.8688	87.0408	37.3032
	402/19/052	Kiyanga	46.629	111.9096	74.6064		186.516	186.516
	402/02/035	Bitereko	56.52	169.56	113.04		282.6	282.6
	402/02/026	Bitereko	56.52	169.56	113.04		282.6	282.6
	402/02/060	Bitereko	78.4215	235.2645	156.843		392.1075	392.1075
	402/28/013	Bunyarguru	282.6	678.24	452.16		1130.4	1130.4
	402/28/026	Bunyarguru	565.2	1356.48	904.32	904.32	3165.12	1356.48
	402/19/046	Kiyanga	93.258	223.8192	149.2128		373.032	373.032
	402/19/006	Bitereko	168.147	504.441	336.294		840.735	840.735
	402/02/050	Bitereko	78.4215	235.2645	156.843		392.1075	392.1075
	402/28/037	Bunyarguru	56.52	169.56			169.56	395.64
	402/02/062	Bitereko	78.4215	235.2645	156.843		392.1075	392.1075
	402/02/004	Bitereko	70.65	169.56	113.04		282.6	282.6
	402/19/045	Kiyanga	64.998	155.9952	103.9968		259.992	259.992
	402/19/004	Kiyanga	24.7275	59.346	39.564	39.564	138.474	59.346
	402/02/092	Bitereko	70.65	211.95	141.3		353.25	353.25
	402/16/018	Bunyarguru	76.302	183.1248	122.0832		305.208	305.208
	402/02/088	Bitereko	84.78	254.34			254.34	593.46
	402/19/023	Bitereko	56.52	135.648	90.432		226.08	226.08
	402/28/006	Ryeru	56.52	135.648	90.432	90.432	316.512	135.648
	402/02/003	Bitereko	169.56	406.944	271.296	271.296	949.536	406.944
	402/02/072	Bitereko	56.52	169.56			169.56	395.64
	402/02/017	Bitereko	78.4215	188.2116	125.4744		313.686	313.686
	402/02/093	Bitereko	56.52	169.56			169.56	395.64
	402/19/024	Kiyanga	56.52	169.56	113.04		282.6	282.6
	402/19/053	Kiyanga	240.21	720.63			720.63	1681.47
	402/02/090	Bitereko	141.3	423.9			423.9	989.1
	402/16/010	Kichwamba	14.13	33.912	22.608	22.608	79.128	33.912
	402/02/028	Bitereko	56.52	169.56	113.04		282.6	282.6
	402/02/091	Bitereko	56.52	169.56			169.56	395.64
	402/19/047	Kiyanga	74.889	179.7336	119.8224		299.556	299.556
	402/02/019	Bitereko	84.78	254.34	169.56		423.9	423.9
	402/28/035	Bunyarguru	56.52	169.56			169.56	395.64
	402/02/086	Bitereko	141.3	423.9	282.6		706.5	706.5

	402/19/044	Kiyanga	56.52	135.648	90.432		226.08	226.08
	402/16/020	Bunyarguru	152.3214	365.57136	243.71424		609.2856	609.2856
	402/16/013	Kichwamba	15.9669	38.32056	25.54704	25.54704	89.41464	38.32056
	402/02/024	Bitereko	24.5862	73.7586	49.1724		122.931	122.931
	402/19/048	Kiyanga	84.78	203.472	135.648		339.12	339.12
	402/16/015	Kichwamba	21.195	50.868	33.912	33.912	118.692	50.868
	402/02/009	Bitereko	156.9843	470.9529	313.9686		784.9215	784.9215
	402/02/008	Bitereko	196.1244	588.3732	392.2488		980.622	980.622
	402/02/023	Bitereko	98.0622	294.1866	196.1244		490.311	490.311
	402/02/013	Bitereko	196.1244	588.3732	392.2488		980.622	980.622
	402/02/070	Bitereko	98.91	296.73	197.82		494.55	494.55
	402/19/042	Bitereko	254.34	763.02	508.68		1271.7	1271.7
	402/19/042b	Kiyanga	109.6488	328.9464	219.2976		548.244	548.244
	402/19/017	Kiyanga	156.9843	376.76232	251.17488		627.9372	627.9372
	402/02/021	Bitereko	137.3436	412.0308	274.6872		686.718	686.718
	402/02/019	Bitereko	56.52	169.56	113.04		282.6	282.6
	402/19/022	Kiyanga	84.78	254.34	169.56		423.9	423.9
	402/02/001	Bitereko	45.4986	109.19664	72.79776	72.79776	254.79216	109.19664
	402/02/002	Bitereko	141.3	339.12	226.08	226.08	791.28	339.12
	402/28/025	Bunyarguru	423.9	1017.36	678.24	678.24	2373.84	1017.36
	402/02/027	Bitereko	156.9843	376.76232	251.17488		627.9372	627.9372
	402/02/010	Bitereko	156.9843	470.9529	313.9686		784.9215	784.9215
	402/02/007	Bitereko	56.52	169.56	113.04		282.6	282.6
	402/02/036	Bitereko	156.9843	376.76232	251.17488		627.9372	627.9372
	402/02/064	Bitereko	78.4215	235.2645	156.843		392.1075	392.1075
	402/02/086	Bitereko	141.3	423.9			423.9	989.1
	402/02/016	Bitereko	156.9843	376.76232	251.17488		627.9372	627.9372
	402/19/049	Kiyanga	56.52	135.648	90.432		226.08	226.08
	402/02/049	Bitereko	98.91	296.73	197.82		494.55	494.55
	402/02/056	Bitereko	56.52	135.648	90.432		226.08	226.08
	402/02/034	Bitereko	98.91	296.73	197.82		494.55	494.55
	402/28/004	Ryeru	42.39	101.736	67.824	67.824	237.384	101.736
	402/16/014	Bunyarguru	14.13	33.912	22.608		56.52	56.52
	402/28/033	Bunyarguru	56.52	135.648	90.432		226.08	226.08
	402/21/001	Kyamhunga	56.52	169.56	113.04		282.6	282.6
	402/02/057	Bitereko	56.52	169.56	113.04		282.6	282.6
	402/19/008	Kiyanga	70.65	211.95	141.3		353.25	353.25
	402/02/031	Bitereko	56.52	169.56	113.04		282.6	282.6
	402/19/043	Kiyanga	56.52	135.648	90.432		226.08	226.08
	402/19/019	Kiyanga	86.193	206.8632	137.9088	137.9088	482.6808	206.8632
	402/19/059	Kiyanga	84.78	254.34			254.34	593.46
	402/02/029	Bitereko	156.9843	376.76232	251.17488		627.9372	627.9372
	402/02/089	Bitereko	56.52	169.56			169.56	395.64
	402/19/021	Kiyanga	84.78	254.34	169.56		423.9	423.9
	402/28/020	Bunyarguru	70.65	169.56	113.04		282.6	282.6
	402/19/011	Kiyanga	62.7372	150.56928	100.37952		250.9488	250.9488
	402/28/002	Ryeru	226.08	542.592	361.728	361.728	1266.048	542.592

	402/28/002b	Bunyarguru	282.6	678.24	452.16		1130.4	1130.4
	402/19/005	Kiyanga	56.52	135.648	90.432	90.432	316.512	135.648
	402/28/022	Bunyarguru	170.2665	408.6396	272.4264		681.066	681.066
	402/02/068	Bitereko	56.52	169.56	113.04		282.6	282.6
	402/28/009	Ryeru	42.39	101.736	67.824	67.824	237.384	101.736
	402/19/001	Kiyanga	33.912	81.3888	54.2592	54.2592	189.9072	81.3888
	402/02/022	Bitereko	56.52	169.56			169.56	395.64
	402/02/075	Bitereko	84.78	254.34	169.56		423.9	423.9
	402/02/087	Bitereko	56.52	169.56			169.56	395.64
	402/19/009	Kiyanga	226.08	542.592	361.728		904.32	904.32
							64612.336	67420.928

8. Community Participation in Project Governance

8.0 Community Participation in project Governance

The communities play a key role in the project. They participate in electing their leaders: for example the chairman and entire executive of the group carbon association is elected by them. These work hand in hand with the sub county carbon coordinators. Producers also do peer group monitoring where they recommend corrective actions to each other. This enhances information flow amongst the project participants and most importantly the carbon producers. Through the community meetings, the producers in Hoima and Masindi were able to nominate coordinators for their respective groups as follows:

Table 10 Masindi and Hoima Group Coordinators

Names of coordinators ⁶	Location:	Tel. contact.
	Butoole Parish Kyangwali S/C	0753803305
	Kidoma Parish Kiziranfumbi	0774315107
	Siiba Kigorobya S/c	0772989124
	Karujubu	-
	Pakanyi	078447648
	Kijwera Parish	0773662121
	Nyangahya S/c Rukondwa parish Bwijanga	0779400405
	Budongo	

⁶ Due to data protection rules, the names of participants have been removed from the public version of this report

9. Social and Environmental Benefits

9.1 Social benefits

The producers are organized in associations which they use as a platform to discuss several issues. So the project has enhanced togetherness of the community occasionally coming up with joint income generating activities. Furthermore, because they are organized, other project are selecting these producers as targeted beneficiaries Through these association communities discuss issues such as obtaining loans from their local bank. Presently producers in the carbon project are able to access soft loans using the carbon finance they get as security. Reports from the bank indicate that a regular income as that from carbon finance is a prerequisite for accessing credit. A socio-economic impact survey to assess the actual impact of the TGB on livelihoods has recently been completed, however, the results are yet to be reported.

9.2 Environmental benefits

The project is being implemented in an ecosystem vulnerable region (the albertine region) which has several endemic and endangered species of flora and fauna. The project has created several environmental benefits such as watershed management, conservation of biodiversity, protection of indigenous plant species and buffering of the protected and forest reserves neighbouring the forest. In addition, the project has improved soil and water conservation which has increased crop performance hence, productivity.

10. Breakdown of Operational Costs

A total of USD \$100,318.29 (59,966.71 from carbon finance and 40,351.58 from other sources) was spent on project operations during the reporting period. The table below indicates the breakdown of all operational costs connected to the project, including those that have been met by the carbon finance and those that have been met by other donors:

Table 11 Breakdown of Operational Costs

Budget line	Carbon Sales contribution	Other donors (mainly USAID)
Salaries	30000	24505.91
Office running	7891.944	2666.67
Monitoring	5770.22	0
Vehicle running costs	4000	2250
Other travel (meetings & workshops)	2080.78	0
Project Development (surveys, technical specs, baseline surveys for new areas)	0	10929
Field coordinators	469.44	0
Project third party verification	9754.33	0
TOTAL	59966.71	40351.58

11. Improvements and Future Development

11.1 Expansion of the project to Northern Uganda

ECOTRUST has received a request from the Tree Talk programme of the Straight Talk Foundation to conduct a feasibility and further prepare a concept for the expansion of TGB to northern Uganda. The proposed expansion is targeting the districts of Amuru, Adjumani, Moyo and Kitgum in Northern Uganda. This is part of a USAID funded programme promoting the reduction of biodiversity loss in key conservation landscapes that include Agoro-agu Central Forest Reserve (CFR) in Kitgum, Mt Otzi CFR in Moyo, East Madi Wildlife Reserve in Adjumani among others. The communities and schools have expressed interest in planting indigenous trees and are looking at carbon finance to support the sustainable management of woodlots. This will be implemented as a joint venture between ECOTRUST and Tree Talk.

11.2 Verification

The project now in its sixth year has started third party verification and plans to continue on an annual basis. Furthermore, should the just concluded verification exercise report indicates areas that need corrective action, the project will work towards improving those areas..

11.3 Technical specifications:

There is need for the revision of technical specifications based on the information that has been generated by the project regarding growth rates. The earlier versions of the technical specifications were based mainly on literature since there was very limited growing of indigenous trees prior to the project. In addition, the new project area of northern Uganda may require specific technical specifications depending on the tree species that the producers may express interest in. Furthermore, some communities with forest on communal land have expressed interest in joining the programme under an avoided deforestation programme. There is need therefore of developing technical specifications as well as a management system for such a project. TGB will mainly target community forests in the Masindi and Hoima Districts especially those that are part of the Bugoma Budongo wildlife corridor.

11.4 Pest and disease control

An attack on *Measopsis eminii*, *Cedrella sp* and *Prunus africana* has been observed. Samples for *Measopsis eminii* were taken to the National Forestry Resources Research Institute (NAFFORI). We are yet to get the results and communicate to the affected producers. For *Prunus africana*, it was affected by

caterpillars which ate leaves and made some to dry up. However, during the rain season the trees have recovered. No measures including spraying other than keen observation of the affected plants was done.

11.5 Monitoring Protocols

The process of monitoring producers for the different aspects of their *plan vivos* is becoming more time consuming. As the number of new producers increases, this will be even more hard work. The project needs to increase the number of interns who work as field assistants as well as to document the monitoring protocols and train the field coordinators on how to use the protocols. In addition, the project will identify potential partners in the respective new project areas, who have a strong presence within the respective communities and with the technical and organizational capacity to participate in such a project.