TREES FOR GLOBAL BENEFITS PROGRAM IN UGANDA

A Plan Vivo Project Annual Report

February 2011

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Plates

Appendences

List of Acronyms

ASARECA	Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa
CARE	Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere
CCAFS	Climate Change Agriculture and Food Security
CCF	Carbon Community Fund
ECOTRUST	Environment Conservation Trust of Uganda
ES	Ecosystem Services
ICRAF	World Agroforestry Centre
PRESA	Pro-poor Rewards for Environmental Services in Africa
REPA	Rights Equity and Protected Areas
PES	Payment for Ecosystem Services
PIN	Project Idea Note
PDD	Project Design Document
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
TFGB	Trees For Global Benefit
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
STAR	Sustainable Tourism in the Albertine Rift
WWF	World Wild Fund
IFAD	International Find for Agricultural Development
VIC	Visitor information Centre
EU	European Union
WFP	World Food Programme
FAO	Food & Agricultural Organisation
DFID	Department for International Development
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency

IPA	Innovations for Poverty Actions
IIED	International Institute for Environment and Development
NEMA	National Environment Management Authority
CSWCT	Chimpanzee Sanctuary and Wildlife Conservation Trust

Key Events, Developments and Challenges

Trees for Global Benefits is a community carbon management scheme linking small – scale landholder farmers to the voluntary carbon market, based on the Plan Vivo system. This report presents the progress of the project activities for the year 2010.

1.1 Key Developments

1.1.1 Expansion of Project Area

During the reporting period, the project has invested in expansion of its area of coverage. The selected areas of expansion included two mountain ecosystems; Rwenzori (Western Uganda) and Elgon in Eastern Uganda. Whereas a new expansion concept will be needed for the Mt. Elgon area, the Kasese area was already included in the original PDD together with Bushenyi District. However, it is only during this reporting period that the project started to actively recruit farmers from Kasese

1.1.1.1 Kasese

With support from various partners: ASARECA, CARE International, ICRAF/ PRESA, the TFGB project has been mobilising carbon producers in Kasese District, specifically in areas surrounding Mountain Rwenzori National Park to participate in Payment for Environmental Services Schemes (PES). CARE International has supported the formation of the participating groups as part of a wider collaborative natural resource management project under their REPA (Rights, Equity & Protected Areas) programme.

Through the ICRAF/PRESA project, the TFGB project was able to conduct the background surveys that established the need for the project in the area as well as the required technical specifications. The PRESA project has also supported the training of two groups that have joined and planted trees during the reporting period. Furthermore, PRESA has supported the building of capacity for the farmers to access markets for the other products e.g. honey. The communities in Kasese are working on an eco-label for their honey.

ASARECA has supported the assessment of other environmental services as well as supporting the building of capacity for local partners to effectively participate in Payment for Environmental Services schemes.

1.1.1.2 Mt Elgon Area

This is an area that lies in Eastern Uganda and has significant and critical biodiversity. The key values of Mt. Elgon region are natural heritage, biodiversity, water catchment, agricultural base and tourism. The area has been proposed for nomination under the World Convention on Heritage Sites[1]. With support from ASARECA, ECOTRUST has conducted an assessment of the value of Ecosystem Services (ES) in the Mt. Elgon area. ECOTRUST gone further and carried out socio-economic assessments to establish the potential for a carbon offset scheme. In addition, ECOTRUST has

[1] Lake Victoria Basin Commission 2009

conducted a biomass assessment to establish the sequestration potential of the desired farming systems and data is still being analysed.

1.1.1.2 New Locations in Old Sites

The project has continued to receive applications for extension of the activities in additional sub-counties within the old districts (especially Masindi). Farmers in some of the sub-counties (Miria and Kamengo) neighbouring areas where the project is operating in Masindi District have expressed interest in planting trees. Furthermore, there is expression of interest by farmers and local leaders Biiso Sub-county which currently belongs to a new neighbouring Buliisa district.

1.2 Key Events

Trees for Global Benefits has continued to be consulted to provide a learning experience at a number of international discussions regarding related to financing for agriculture, food security, forestry and climate change. The meetings that the project has participated in include those hosted by IFAD, Bill Gates, Green Belt Movement, Climate Change Agriculture & Food Security (CCAFS).

1.2.1 Plan vivo stakeholder conference 2010:

ECOTRUST participated in the Plan vivo stakeholder conference that was held in Edinburgh in November 2010. The aim of the meeting was to bring stakeholders together to discuss the development of the Plan vivo system and standard as well as continually scale-up of Plan Vivo activities. The participants also discussed topics that included marketing and funding models for community carbon, Plan Vivo and REDD+ etc.

1.2.2 Conference on Payments for Ecosystem Services in East and Central Africa Sub-region,

In collaboration with several partners (ASARECA, NAHI, KARI, Moi University, VIRED), ECOTRUST organized a sub-regional conference on Payment for Environmental Services (PES) in East and Central Africa. This was under the ASERECA funded project entitled Valuation, Attribution and Compensation of Ecosystem Services in Eastern and Central Africa. The conference aimed at bringing together researchers to share results of diverse researches on PES and stimulating discussion on starting PES Projects and participate in climate change negotiations including transboundary resources. This was an opportunity for researchers, policy makers and community leaders to share research finding and experiences in developing PES schemes and agree on initiatives to implement PES at local, national or regional level. A framework for an alliance PES for the entire region with the aim of implementing PES was also developed during the workshop. The conference focused on the various ES mainly watershed management, carbon sequestration as well as the institutional and policy issues necessary for implementing sustainable PES schemes. The discussions involved the current and emerging environmental issues related to the East and Central African landscapes and highlighted opportunities presented by PES schemes for local communities and for environmental conservation. The Keynote address was presented by Elaine Muir from the Plan Vivo Foundation in Edinburgh.

1.2.3 Capacity-Building for Agricultural Carbon Projects in Africa; Nov. 2010.

Two staff members from ECOTRUST attended a workshop organised by The *Institutional Analysis and Capacity-Building for Agricultural Carbon Projects in Africa* project, managed by EcoAgriculture Partners and Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS) Programme. The initiative supports developers and managers of agricultural carbon projects in Africa to establish projects that

pay farmers for the environmental services they provide, while ensuring that these projects support local sustainable development priorities and are cost-effective. The workshop engaged ECOTRUST and other five agricultural carbon projects in Africa, and aimed at assessing how projects organize themselves in order to best serve the interests of farmers. Knowledge was shared between projects and research methodology for field work developed. After the workshop, a researcher(s) planned to visit ECOTRUST project site to document some of its institutional characteristics and develop a baseline that will allow for comparative analysis across projects.

1.3 Other Developments

1.3.1 REDD + Preparedness Process

The project through the Programme Officer – Gerald Kairu, has participated in the REDD+ preparedness process for Uganda. The process is spearheaded by the National Forestry Authority under Uganda's Ministry of Water and Environment. Furthermore, ECOTRUST has been selected to lead consultations of the communities and other REDD+ stakeholders in Western Uganda as part of the process to develop a REDD+ preparedness proposal.

1.3.2 Visit by Plan Vivo Foundation staff

The Plan Vivo Foundation visited some of the TFGB implementation sites. The field visit conducted by Elaine Muir, a Programme Manager at the Plan Vivo Foundation coincided with an invitation to the International Conference on Payments for Ecosystem Services in East and Central Africa Sub-region, Jinja, Uganda. The Plan Vivo Foundation was invited to deliver the keynote address and to outline their experience of delivering PES in developing countries. After the conference, a trip was arranged for the Plan Vivo Foundation to visit some of the project sites and producers. The aim of the trip was to visit a sample of producers to discuss their experiences with the project, assess how Plan Vivo activities had progressed since the last project visit in 2008 and identify some of the challenges that farmers continue to face.

Visit to the Rural Bank: The Rural Bank explained the process of how payments were transferred to community members. The Bank receives a list from ECOTRUST detailing the farmers who have met their monitoring targets and the amounts that has been transferred to be credited on their various individual accounts in the Rural Bank.

Visit to Producers: Two farmers in the Bushenyi region were visited - Reverand Kato and Bonny Mukiga. It was noted that Rev. Kato's site was an excellent example of a *plan vivo*, with a variety of activities implemented on the same piece of land including mixed native woodlot and agroforestry as shown in the Plate 1.

Photo by Elaine Muir **Plate 1: Agro forestry system- coffee intercropped with shade trees. On the right is the carbon producer.**

Community meeting: A meeting consisting of producers in Bitereko was organised and attended by the visiting Plan Vivo staff (Plate 2). Producers' expressed their happiness and appreciation to the Plan Vivo for the work being done especially enabling them (producers) to access carbon finance.

Photo by Elaine Muir

Plate 2: Carbon producers, Plan Vivo staff (second from left) and ECOTRUST officials attending a meeting at Bitereko Sub county

Visit to Kasese: Kasese (near the Rwenzori Mountains National Park) is one of the sites that the project is proposing for expansion. At this site, visits were made to a nursery site, and farms where implemention for agroforestry and boundary planting systems are on-going. Plate 3 shows a farm were boundary planting is being practiced.

Plate 3: Boundary planting on farm in Kasese

Meeting with TreeTalk: A meeting was organised for the Plan Vivo foundation to assess the capacity of Tree talk, a local NGO to manage a carbon offset scheme in Northern Uganda in partnership with ECOTRUST. Partnerships with NGOs/CBOs with a strong presence as well agro-forestry expertise is one of the strategies that the project is employing to extend to other parts of the country. Tree Talk the Northern Uganda project partner is an environmental programme and is part of a larger organisation – Straight Talk Foundation – which is involved with the communication of health and development issues. Although the Straight Talk Foundation was established in 1993, the Tree Talk programme started in

2002 with funding from DFID, WFP, FAO, USAID, EU and DANIDA. The objective of Tree Talk ‘’*enhance rural livelihoods and support poverty alleviation, to improve awareness on the importance of biodiversity and conservation of Protected Areas and to impart skills and build resilience towards the impending impacts of climate change”* is consistent with that of Tree for Global Benefits.

1.3.3 Equator Snow Lodge

A first class eco-lodge Eco-lodge ‘Equator Snow Mountain Lodge’ has been constructed to complement the project activities in the Rwenzoris through a partnership between ECOTRUST and Geo-lodges. The lodge, which is expected to be fully operational in 2011 is part of an exciting community–based tourism programme to be implemented together with the Rwenzori Communities, at the Rwenzori Mountains Gateway. This is one of the efforts for ECOTRUST to reach out to the wider community in which the carbon project operates. The Rwenzori Mountains Gateway is a 35ha piece of formerly degraded farmland that was purchased by ECOTRUST with funding from WWF and has now been converted into a private nature reserve through assisted natural regeneration. Although the process of regeneration sequesters carbon, the reserve is not generating any credits. It is rather investing in eco-tourism as means of involving communities in its conservation.

In addition to providing first class accommodation to visitors, the Eco-Lodge will generate income for improved community livelihoods as well as for supporting conservation in the area. Geo-lodges, the private sector partner brings a wealth of experience in the hospitality industry and is committed to training the local communities, building their capacity to provide first class hospitality services- the kind that befits the quality of this lodge. In addition to the lodge, the Gateway will also have a Visitor Information Center (VIC) as well as a Forest Exploration Programme.

1.3.4 Visits by other Projects

The project hosted a US based International NGO called Village in Action in one of the villages in Bwijanga Masindi district, to understand the role played by TFGB in the improvement of livelihoods of the communities. Farmers testified that the carbon finance that farmers get through planting of trees is being used for various purposes - for example, some farmers use this money to take their children to school while others use it to buy agricultural inputs like simple agricultural tools, improved cereals and nuts for planting. Through these, farmers are able to get higher yields.

1.4 Challenges

Fires

There was one fire incidence in Masindi, where a mentally disturbed person set a farm belonging to one of the carbon producers (Mugisa Jackson Matovu) ablaze. Mugisa is one of the newly recruited farmers who had signed his carbon sales contract. Monitoring results showed that although Mugisa has met his target, 75% of the trees he planted were burnt. The project is still discussing with Mugisha to find ways of keeping him motivated to continue with the project.

Delays in submission of supporting documents

The project is experiencing delays from some of the newly recruited farmers in sending the supporting documents; mainly passport photographs and account numbers to the field offices. Facilities such as studios to take pictures are far from some of these project locations. Furthermore, the farmers in Masindi have continued to prefer accounts in big banks, which are located in town as opposed to the

village banks. Some of them only open the accounts for purposes of carbon finance. This in turn causes delays in finalising the agreements and thus dispatching the carbon finance.

Performance attainment & monitoring dates

There have been cases of farmers making very significant improvements immediately after the monitoring exercise and allocation of available sales has been concluded. These farmers expect a contract and payments immediately since sometimes they even achieve more than the target. It is very difficult for these farmers to understand that the difference in timing contributed to who gets allocated and paid first. This has resulted in some disgruntled farmers who instead of accepting responsibility for their not meeting the set target on time simply claim that that their payments have been delayed.

Poor Tree Management

There is reluctance by some farmers to delay spot weeding/general weeding/slashing. These delays results in the trees not looking healthy and are etiolated. This in turn, makes the monitoring process difficult and tedious in this bushy environment for the team.

Estimating Land Size

Farmers cannot correctly estimate the size of their land. This is partly because of low literacy rates and lack of appropriate tools to use to measure their land. During sensitisation meetings, attempts have been made to train participants in simple user-friendly ways of measuring land, for example, by using sticks of known length to measure the entire boundary. Secondly, use of pace factor/strides as another local way of measuring. Further trainings will carried out to the wider community to ensure that they can fairly estimate the size of their land. The challenge of the farmer not being able to correctly estimate his/her land is that it causes an unnecessary argument about the correct size of land etc.

1.5 Suggestions to address the challenges

The project will continue to emphasize the tree management requirements to farmers during the different workshops.

2. Activities

The TFGB Plan Vivo project has continued to implement the activities in compliance with the Plan Vivo Standard. There are also cases where some farmers change the land use plan (*plan vivo*) by planting trees in areas that were not originally on the *plan vivo*. The farmers that have changed land use plans have been requested to re-draw them and they are complying.

The project is in the process of developing specifications for the new sites (Mt. Elgon) as well as for new activities such as improved forest management. With support from ASARECA, the project has carried out biomass and socio economic assessments. The results from these assessments will

provide information on the preferred farming systems as well the data that will be used to develop the respective technical specifications for Mt. Elgon area. This work was funded under the ASERECA project that is developing tools for valuation, attribution and compensation of ecosystem services of east and central Africa.

3. Sales

A total of 80,879tCO_2 has been sold to buyers in 2010. In addition, the project will be holding 18,091 Plan Vivo Certificates as unsold credits in its regisytry account. Below is a list of the sales and distribution of funds.

Buyer	tCO_2	Price/t CO_2 ($)	Total Price	Total Sale Price in US$	Certificate issuance fee ($0.30) + Registry fee ($0.05)	Third Party Verification	ET	Producer		
								To the Individual	Contribution to CCF	Total % to community
U&W	28538	*								62%
Ceramica Sant'Agostino S.p.A	1615	*								58%
Tetra Pak	15100	*								62%
Uganda Carbon Bureau (UCB)	199	*								41%
Internatinal Lifeline Fund (via UCB)	123	*								41%
Straight Plc	1000	*								58%
IIED	779	*								49%
U&W Coop Denmark & other	3111	*								58%

Embassy of Denmark Kampala	414	*								49%
Nedbank	30000	*								62%
Unsold stocks	18,091	*								62%
	98,970	*								62%

*pricing information has been removed to ensure client confidentiality

Table 1: Carbon sales in 2010

Key
ET = ECOTRUST
CCF = Carbon Community Fund
Third Party Verification: Contribution to all third party verification & validation as and when they take place

4. Allocation of Sales to Producers

In 2010, a total of 323 farmers generating 86,604tCO2 from Bushenyi, Hoima, Masindi and Kasese have been allocated various buyers. In addition, the project will be holding 18,091 tCO2 from 72 farmers as unsold certificates in the registry. Table 2 shows the number of farmers allocated to the different buyers in the respective sites. Table 3 shows the balance of allocations.

Table 2: Summary allocation per site

Buyer	Sale (tCO2)	Buyer Price ($)	Producers Description			Price to producer ($)	Monitored? (Y/N)	Payment due
			Location	Number of producers	Area (ha)			
U&W10 Folksam	3,002		Bitereko	4	6		Y	Apr-11
			Kiyanga	6	8.5		Y	Apr-11
				10	**14.5**			
U&W10 Other	828		Budongo	2	2		Y	Apr-11
			Bitereko	1	1		Y	
			Kabwoya	1	1		Y	Apr-11
				4	**4**			
U&W-Coop Denmark (other)	3,111		Bitereko	7	7.5		Y	Apr-11
			Kiziranfumbi	2	4			
			Kiyanga	4	4.75		Y	Apr-11
				13	**16.25**			
U&W Max	24,708		Bitereko	34	39.5		Y	Apr-11
			Budongo	2	3		y	Apr-11
			Bwijanga	1	1	3.74	y	Apr-11
			Kichwamba	3	3		y	Apr-11
			Kiyanga	39	47.25		y	Apr-11
			Kyangwali	6	10		y	Apr-11
			Ryeru	10	17.75		Y	Apr-11
				95	**121.5**			
Tetrapk10	15,100		Bitereko	30	30.5		Y	Apr-11
			Bwijanga	5	6		y	Apr-11
			Kabwoya	3	3		y	Apr-11
			Kanyabwanga	2	2		y	Apr-11
			Kiyanga	8	12.5		y	Apr-11
			Kiziranfumbi	9	10		y	Apr-11
			Kyangwali	4	5.75		y	Apr-11
			Budongo	4	6		Y	Apr-11
				65	**75.75**			

Buyer	Sale (tCO2)	Buyer Price ($)	Producers Description			Price to producer ($)	Monitored? (Y/N)	Payment due
			Location	Number of producers	Area (ha)			
Uganda Carbon Bureau	199		Bitereko	**2**	**1.75**		Y	Apr-11
International Lifeline	123						Y	Apr-11
Ceramica Sant'Agostino S.P.A	1,615		Bitereko	**5**	**7.25**		Y	Apr-11
Prior Year Adjustments**	5,725		Kiyanga	4	8.25		Y	Apr-11
			Kichwamba	6	6.25		**y**	Apr-11
			Ryeru	9	14.25		y	Apr-11
				19	**28.75**			
IIED	779		Kichwamba	**3**	**3.75**		y	Apr-11
Embassy of Denmark	414		Ryeru	**1**	**2.25**		y	Apr-11
Straight PLC	1,000		Ryeru	**4**	**4.75**		y	Apr-11
Nedbank	30,000		Ryeru	31	59		y	Apr-11
			Pakanyi	4	4.25		y	Apr-11
			Nyangahya	4	4.5		y	Apr-11
			Muhokya	1	4		y	Apr-11
			Maliba	9	19.8		y	Apr-11
			Kyangwali	14	14		y	Apr-11
			Kiziranfumbi	14	14.75		y	Apr-11
			Kiyanga	18	17.75		y	Apr-11
			Kigorobya	3	3.25		y	Apr-11
			Bwijanga	2	3.4		Y	Apr-11
			Bugoye	2	3.4			
				102	**148.1**			
ECOTRUST	18,091		Kichwamba	28	26.875		y	Apr-11
			Kabwoya	11	11		y	Apr-11
			Bunyaruguru	8	22.75		y	Apr-11
			Bugoye	5	5		y	Apr-11
			Budongo	1	1		y	Apr-11
			Bitereko	12	13.25		y	Apr-11
			Ryeru	7	9.75		y	Apr-11
				72	**89.625**			
Total	**104,695*** **		**Total**	**395**	**518.225**			

Note: Price per producer includes contribution to CCF as according to producer contract.

****Adjustment to account for last year's shortfall (due to mis-calculation of risk buffer level)***

***** Total sales (including the allocation of 5,725 for prior year adjustments)***

Table 3: Allocation for 2010 compared with sales for the same year.

Buyer	Total tCO2 Allocated	Total tCO2 purchased	Deficit/Over Supply
U&W10 Folksam	2949.3	3,002	-53
U&W10 Other	813.6	828	-14
U&W Max	24713.1	24,708	5
U&W-Coop Denmark	2084.85	2,111	-26
U&W (other)	813.6	1,000	-186
UCB/Lifeline	355.95	322	34
Tetrapk10	15102.45	15,100	2
Ceramica Sant'Agostino S.P.A	1474.65	1,615	-140
Prior Year Adjustments	5847.75	5,725	123
IIED	762.75	779	-16
Embassy of Denmark	457.65	414	44
Straight PLC	966.15	1,000	-34
Nedbank	30123.54	30,000	124
ECOTRUST	18229.73	18,091	139
	104695.065	**104695.07**	**0**

5. Participation and recruitment

5.1 Recruitment

The project has invested a lot of effort in the recruitment of new producers as well as in the provision opportunities for producers to actively participate in the project. During this reporting period (2010), the project has processed a total of 695 applications submitted by farmers from the districts of Bushenyi, Hoima, Masindi and Kasese. Out of these 395 farmers have been able to fulfill the requirements of entering into agreements to undertake project activities on 518ha of land and have received or are in the process of receiving payments. The remaining 298 with 379ha of land are at different stages of fulfilling the project requirements.

District	Sub-county	Total Processed	Total Fulfilling requirements
Bushenyi	Bitereko	164	95
	Kiyanga	155	79
	Ryeru	99	62
	Kichwamba	68	40
	Bunyaruguru	4	8
	Kanyabwanga	8	2

	Sub total	**498**	**286**
Hoima	Kyangwali	48	24
	Kiziranfumbi	47	25
	Kabwoya	18	15
	Kaseta	0	0
	Sub total	**113**	**64**
Masindi	Kigorobya	3	3
	Bwijanga	12	8
	Budongo	21	9
	Nyangahya	7	4
	Pakanyi	22	4
	Sub total	**65**	**28**
Kasese	Bugoye	9	7
	Maliba	9	9
	Muhokya	1	1
	Sub total	**19**	**17**
	GRAND TOTAL	**695**	**395**

Table 4: 2010 Recruitment

Year of Allocation	Number of farmers allocated to buyer
2003	30
2004	54
2006	18
2007	34
2008	268
2009	110
2010	395
Total	**909**

Table 5: Total number of farmers recruited by the project from 2003 - 2010

5.2 Farmer Sensitisation and Training

During this reporting period a number of sensitizations (including induction) and trainings have been carried out. The trainings have been focusing on ensuring that the different stages in the Plan Vivo cycle are clearly understood by both the potential and participating producers. Training workshops were conducted in all the project sites. These included both new and already participating farmers. During the meetings, the farmers were able to share and learn how the project operates. This is an opportunity for whoever would like to understand the various aspects/components of the project before they join it. This is critical given the long term nature of the project and also due to the fact that tree planting competes with other land use activities. The workshops also included ideas on the enterprises that farmers can conduct within their woodlots. The groups especially in Bushenyi i.e. Bitereko, Bunyaruguru and Kiyanga received training in project identification, design and management as part of the Community Carbon Fund (CCF) application process. The groups in Hoima also received similar training but it was not as detailed as for Bushenyi, since they are still in their early formative stages and still dealing with some group dynamics. Although trainings are held at different sites, the content is the same and generally covers the topics listed below:

- Importance of tree planting to a farmer and the global community
- Tree planting and climate change
- Carbon and carbon sequestration
- A brief overview of the carbon project (Trees for Global Benefit as a case study), its purpose and area of operation
- Farmer recruitment process / project cycle i.e. sensitisation, application & plan vivo, verification, monitoring and carbon sale)
- Tree planting systems promoted and tree proportions (basing on tree classification) promoted
- Nursery and tree management
- Carbon Community Fund; Accessing it through the available guidelines

The project also held short training sessions targeting 10 to 15 participants at different stages of the project, discussing a variety of topics related to the project. These provide more interaction between the facilitators and participants and are very productive. They mainly target farmers in a specific locality, so producers don't have to travel long distances which is the case for large group training.

Table 6 shows the sites where sensitizations/training meetings have been done, including the number of trainings per site and number of participants attending the training.

Table 6: Community training in 2010

Details				Percent(%)	
District	**Site**	**Number of Trainings**	**Number of participants**	**Male**	**Female**
Bushenyi	Bitereko	3	356	72	28
	Ryeru/rutoto	3	165	88	12
	Kichwamba/Katerera	1	47	91	9
	Kiyanga	2	211	85	15
Masindi	Bwijanga	2	87	62.1	37.9
	Ongo	1	28	71.4	28.6
	Karujubu	2	45	64.4	35.6
	Pakanyi	3	86	73.3	26.7
	Nyantonzi	0	0	0	0
	Nyagahya	2	63	60.3	39.7
Hoima	Kiziranfumbi	1	46	85	15
	Kyangwali	2	127	84	16
	Kabwoya	1	30	20	10
	Kaseeta	2	92	92	8
Kasese	Ruboni	1	49	60	40
	Maliba	1	20	80	20
Totals		**27**	**1452**		

5.4 Revised Guidelines for seedlings management

The project has further refined the guidelines that are being used in the management of seedling distribution to interested farmers. Availability of quality seedlings has been a challenge and yet it is critical to the success of the project. There have been issues on the timing of approvals, making of orders and the planting seasons. Experience has shown that farmers who take advantage of the seedling on credit system, are better at attaining targets compared to those that are not. The guidelines will ensure timely supply of good quality and recommended tree species from approved nursery operators. The guidelines give an opportunity for orders by farmers with approved *plan vivos* to be made in time for the next planting season.

6.0 Summary of Monitoring Results

One of the main developments in the monitoring of carbon producers has been the introduction of peer group monitoring. This has been piloted in the previous years but has been always conducted in collaboration with ECOTRUST staff. We have had experienced farmers pairing up with ECOTRUST staff to monitor farmers from a different group. For this reporting period however, the experienced farmers were sent to the field in groups and conducted the monitoring without the ECOTRUST staff. The results were later verified by ECOTRUST staff. However, this was carried out only in the old sites of Ryeru, Kichwamba, Bitereko & Bunyaruguru and also covering farmers in year 1 and above. The project has not yet developed enough capacity among the farmers at the relatively new sites of Hoima, Masindi and Kasese. The monitoring at these sites continues to be fully conducted by ECOTRUST staff. Fortunately, there are field offices and staff in these districts. Table 7 is a summary of monitoring results. Detailed verification and monitoring results are shown in Appendix 2

Table 7: Monitoring results

District	Site	Number of producers				
		Year 0	Year 1	Year 3	Year 5	Year 10
Bushenyi	Bitereko	101	39	9	17	0
	Ryeru/rutoto	81	14	9	0	0
	Kichwamba/Katerera	52	1	12	0	0
	Kiyanga	87	32	3	9	0
	Kanyabwanga	2	5	0	0	0
Masindi	Bwijanga	10	2	1	0	0
	Ongo	0	7	0	0	0
	Karujubu	0	1	1	0	0
	Pakanyi	5	0	0	0	0
	Budongo	10	17	5	0	0
	Nyagahya	6	7	5	0	0
	Kigorobya	3	0	0	0	0

Hoima	Kiziramfumbi	39	2	0	0	0
	Kyangwali	40	3	0	0	0
	Kabwoya	17	0	0	0	0
	Kaseeta	17	0	0	0	0
N. Uganda	Kitgum	0	0	0	0	0
	Adjumani	0	0	0	0	0
Kasese	Bugoye	7	0	0	0	0
	Maliba	10	0	0	0	0
Totals		**487**	**130**	45	26	0

Of the monitored farmers, some did not meet the target as in the carbon sales contract (see Appendix 3). As result they were not paid pending completion of their targets. Table 8 shows results of farmers who did not meet targets at the implementations sites

Table 8: Monitoring results of continuing farmers who did not meet their targets

District	Site	Number
Bushenyi	Bitereko	11
	Ryeru	0
	Kichwamba	1
	Kiyanga	16
Masindi	Bwijanga	1
	Ongo	17
	Karujubu	0
	Pakanyi	0
	Nyantonzi	0
	Nyagahya	5
Hoima	Kiziranfumbi	2

	Kyangwali	1
	Kabwoya	0
Totals		42

6.1 Challenges observed during monitoring

- Seedling thefts and or uprooting due to boundary conflicts: Some producers planted seedlings but are uprooted and stolen by fellow producers and other people. Some producers plant seedlings close to the boundary and these end up being uprooted by the neighbours.
- Trampling of seedlings by domestic animals
- Prolonged drought
- Governance and leadership weaknesses in some groups in Hoima and Masindi
- There was an unusually high number of farmers not fullfiling their requirements due to drought
- Innaccessibility of some of the farms (in hills and mountains) making monitoring rather difficult. It would be unfair not to allow such farmers to plant in these areas for the reason that the pieces of land available to them is in hills. Although it is a very big challenge as far as monitoring is concerned, these sites provide significant environmental benefits such as watershed protection. However, in future, it will be very important to come up with cost effective means of monitoring such farms.

5. Payments to Producers

As is normally the case, all producers who met the targets as specified in the contracts and technical spefications were paid. Most of the payments were made directly to the producers while some were made directly to the nursery operators on behalf of the producers that acquired seedlings on loan. Table 9 and 10 show the direct payments to farmers and to the nursery operators respectively.

Table 9: Summary of payments to producers

Date	District	Amount(US$)
26.05.10	Hoima & Masindi	5632.00
19.07.10	Bushenyi	34578.00
13.10.10	Bushenyi, Hoima and Masindi	5828.00
30.11.10	Bushenyi	15019.00
Total		**61057.00**

Table 10: Amount for Seedlings received by producers

Date	District	Amount(US$)
01.03.10	Bushenyi	3392.00
29.06.10	Bushenyi	4975.00
19.07.10	Bushenyi	4641.00
07.09.10	Hoima and Masindi	1732.00
20.12.10	Hoima, Masindi & Bushenyi	6423.00
Totals		21163.00

The overall payments to producers including advance for seedlings is US$ 82220.00

6. Community Participation in Project Governance

8.1 Farmer Meetings

The farmers at the different sites have continued to hold membership meetings. Some of the key results that came out of the meetings include project ideas to be included for funding under the Community Carbon Fund. Two of the groups (Kiyanga & Bitereko) decided to formalize the registration of the carbon groups as different entities from the broader community development groups that hitherto they have been operating under.

8.2 Community – based monitoring

The project is piloting the involvement of communities in monitoring some of the required aspects like number of trees farmers/area should have as in the carbon sales contract. Community participation in monitoring or Community – Based Monitoring follows the same monitoring procedure and uses tools that have been developed by the TFGB. Draft guidelines have been developed and are being tested to see if quality results can be achieved. The bottom line is that Community based monitoring must achieve the same results as any other external person would meet if he/she monitored the same farmers. This type of monitoring may be advantageous in that members have better information about each other and if well managed can be less expensive that using experts to do it. It also is another way of building capacity of the farmers.

8.3 Carbon Community Fund

Trees for Global Benefits has operationalised the small grants programme under the Carbon Community Fund (where producers agree to deposit a percentage of their payment in a community fund). The programme has started with awarding Four Million Uganda Shillings for projects to be implemented by three groups from Bushenyi. These are Bitereko Carbon Community and Kiyanga Tree Planting Group from Mitooma District and Rubirizi Carbon Farmers Association from Rubirizi District. The funds will be used to set up savings and credit facilities in the three sub-counties. Groups from other districts have not yet submitted proposals for funding but are expected to do so in the coming year. In addition, the CCF has also trained the different groups in project development and management. Furthermore, several meetings will be held with the respective local leadership to identify additional projects that are beneficial to the wider community in which the carbon farmers live.

8.4 Issues arising out of the meetings

Most of the trainings have focused on how the process operates. However, during the training, producers have continuously requested additional training in sourcing and handling of good planting material, fire management, pest and disease control. This is mainly because pests (especially termites) as well as acquisition of seedlings are the main challenges to many potential and already participating producers. Farmers have also expressed interest in knowing how the project coordinator should handle cases of defaulting due to situations beyond one's control e.g. cutting down or destroying their trees by malicious people. The project will be using some of the funds under CCF to give the farmers specific training on how to handle some of these challenges. In response to the seedling challenge, the project has further refined the process of acquiring seedlings on credit as detailed in the section below:

7. Breakdown of Operational Costs

During the reporting period (2010), a total of US$286,296 was spent on the project out of which US$152,796 was spent on developing new sites to join the project. The actual operational costs, without the project development costs, were US$133,500. The project development costs were provided by ASARECA, IFAD/ICRAF/PRESA, CARE International and Standard Chartered Bank Uganda Limited. The Carbon income provided US$96,240 towards the operating costs.

Item	Costs (US$)	Source		Comments
		Carbon income in US$	**Other** (PRESA, ASARECA, CARE, Stanchart Bank)	
Verification	1719	0	1719	Cost met by Max Hamburger
Staff time	90000	65000	25000	100% for 3 Project Officers, Prog Officer, Database Man & 40% 2nd Prog Officer Accounts & Executive Director
Monitoring	10437	10437	0	
Office costs	12000	6000	6000	US$1000 x 12 months inc rent, tel/fax/email, utilities & supplies
Vehicle	7500	3750	3750	annual mileage of 5,000km
Project Devt	155966	3170	152,796	farmer support, scoping of new areas, technical specs, project surveys etc.
Coordinators	2674	2674	0	
Other travel	6000	5209	791	International meetings
Total	**286296**	**96240**	**190,056.49**	

Table 11: Summary of operational costs

8. Improvements and Future Development

10.1 Extension of Project to Mt. Elgon Area

The project is planning to prepare communities in the Mt. Elgon area to begin benefiting from Payment for Environmental Services. The project will produce technical specifications for this area as well as a project development document. The project will discuss with the various stakeholders with guidance from Plan Vivo Foundation on whether this should be registered as a new project area or as an extension of the on-going project.

10.2 Improved Forest Management

The project has continued to receive expression of interest for community participation in improved management of community forests. The project will mobilize resources to enable the expansion into the new activity

10.3 Identification of other project activities

The project will continue identifying opportunities for other activities. For instance, the project would like to invest in clean/renewable energy options.

10.4 Building Local Stakeholder Involvement in Monitoring

Building on the experiences of peer monitoring, the project is going to invest further in building local capacity to monitor the project activities. In addition to the participating farmers, the project is also going to train other stakeholders from the local government as well as the local National Forest Authority staff in the monitoring of the different project activities. This way, the project expects to strengthen its relations with the local forestry authorities. In addition to training workshops, the project will need some guides that can enable to identify tree species such as; lists of local names and their corresponding English and botanical names as well as classification of trees according to the yield classes or as fast, medium and slow growers

10.5 Equipment

Furtheremore, the project will need to procure additonal Global Positioning System (GPS) machines to ease the capturing of GPS points. The project needs to complete the inclusion of GPS points in the database to be able to Map all TFGB farmers

10.6 Farmer Exchange Visits.

An area that requires more improvement is carrying out cross-exchange visits of farmers from different sites in the district and from one district to the other. This will one way of training through practical observations.

APPENDIX

Appendix 1: List of Producers Allocated to Buyers in 2010 and their monitoring results

Name[2]	Subcounty	Trees at monitoring	Total Target	Area (Ha)	tCO2	Saleable 90%	Buyer
1.	Bitereko	300	400	1	226	203.4	Folksam
2.	Bitereko	270	400	1	226	203.4	Folksam
3.	Bitereko	630	1000	2.5	565	508.5	Folksam
4.	Bitereko	354	600	1.5	339	305.1	Folksam
				6	**1356**	**1220.4**	
1.	Kiyanga	408	400	1	226	203.4	Folksam
2.	Kiyanga	400	400	1	226	203.4	Folksam
3.	Kiyanga	372	400	1	226	203.4	Folksam
4.	Kiyanga	682	800	2	452	406.8	Folksam
5.	Kiyanga	817	1000	2.5	565	508.5	Folksam
6.	Kiyanga	404	400	1	226	203.4	Folksam
				8.5	**1921**	**1728.9**	
				14.5	**3277**	**2949.3**	
1.	Bitereko	380	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
2.	Bitereko	350	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
3.	Bitereko	321	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger

Name[2]	Subcounty	Trees at monitoring	Total Target	Area (Ha)	tCO2	Saleable 90%	Buyer
4.	Bitereko	321	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
5.	Bitereko	310	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
6.	Bitereko	300	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
7.	Bitereko	270	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
8.	Bitereko	270	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
9.	Bitereko	664	1000	2.5	565	508.5	Maxhamburger
10.	Bitereko	257	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
11.	Bitereko	635	1000	2.5	565	508.5	Maxhamburger
12.	Bitereko	380	600	1.5	339	305.1	Maxhamburger
13.	Bitereko	250	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
14.	Bitereko	185	300	0.75	169.5	152.55	Maxhamburger
15.	Bitereko	800	1000	2.5	565	508.5	Maxhamburger
16.	Bitereko	300	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
17.	Bitereko	300	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
18.	Bitereko	273	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
19.	Bitereko	267	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
20.	Bitereko	264	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
21.	Bitereko	251	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
22.	Bitereko	250	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
23.	Bitereko	492	800	2	452	406.8	Maxhamburger
24.	Bitereko	242	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
25.	Bitereko	240	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
26.	Bitereko	179	300	0.75	169.5	152.55	Maxhamburger
27.	Bitereko	232	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger

Name[2]	Subcounty	Trees at monitoring	Total Target	Area (Ha)	tCO2	Saleable 90%	Buyer
28.	Bitereko	231	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
29.	Bitereko	230	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
30.	Bitereko	229	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
31.	Bitereko	226	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
32.	Bitereko	222	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
33.	Bitereko	220	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
34.	Bitereko	149	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
				39.5	**8927**	**8034.3**	
1.	Budongo	1000	1000	2	452	406.8	Maxhamburger
2.	Budongo	303	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
				3	**678**	**610.2**	
1.	Bwijanga	222	400	1	226	**203.4**	Maxhamburger
2.	Kichwamba	372	400	1	226	**203.4**	Maxhamburger
3.	Kichwamba	311	400	1	226	**203.4**	Maxhamburger
4.	Kichwamba	119	400	1	226	**203.4**	Maxhamburger
				4	**904**	**813.6**	
1.	Kiyanga	313	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
2.	Kiyanga	256	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
3.	Kiyanga	382	600	1.5	339	305.1	Maxhamburger
4.	Kiyanga	245	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
5.	Kiyanga	317	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
6.	Kiyanga	238	500	1.25	282.5	254.25	Maxhamburger
7.	Kiyanga	385	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
8.	Kiyanga	157	266	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger

Name[2]	Subcounty	Trees at monitoring	Total Target	Area (Ha)	tCO2	Saleable 90%	Buyer
9.	Kiyanga	220	500	1.25	282.5	254.25	Maxhamburger
10.	Kiyanga	310	600	1.25	282.5	254.25	Maxhamburger
11.	Kiyanga	195	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
12.	Kiyanga	357	800	2	452	406.8	Maxhamburger
13.	Kiyanga	385	600	1.5	339	305.1	Maxhamburger
14.	Kiyanga	300	600	1.5	339	305.1	Maxhamburger
15.	Kiyanga	260	500	1.25	282.5	254.25	Maxhamburger
16.	Kiyanga	220	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
17.	Kiyanga	342	600	1.5	339	305.1	Maxhamburger
18.	Kiyanga	259	500	1.25	282.5	254.25	Maxhamburger
19.	Kiyanga	170	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
20.	Kiyanga	218	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
21.	Kiyanga	217	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
22.	Kiyanga	345	300	0.75	169.5	152.55	Maxhamburger
23.	Kiyanga	538	800	2	452	406.8	Maxhamburger
24.	Kiyanga	375	600	1.5	339	305.1	Maxhamburger
25.	Kiyanga	292	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
26.	Kiyanga	287	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
27.	Kiyanga	213	300	0.75	169.5	152.55	Maxhamburger
28.	Kiyanga	425	600	1.5	339	305.1	Maxhamburger
29.	Kiyanga	272	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
30.	Kiyanga	268	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
31.	Kiyanga	259	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
32.	Kiyanga	259	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger

Name[2]	Subcounty	Trees at monitoring	Total Target	Area (Ha)	tCO2	Saleable 90%	Buyer
33.	Kiyanga	640	1000	2.5	565	508.5	Maxhamburger
34.	Kiyanga	352	600	1.5	339	305.1	Maxhamburger
35.	Kiyanga	352	600	1.5	339	305.1	Maxhamburger
36.	Kiyanga	229	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
37.	Kiyanga	171	300	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
38.	Kiyanga	224	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
39.	Kiyanga	223	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
				47.25	**10678.5**	**9610.65**	
1.	Kyangwali	180	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
2.	Kyangwali	2000	2000	5	1130	1017	Maxhamburger
3.	Kyangwali	245	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
4.	Kyangwali	188	400	1	226	**203.4**	U&W-other
5.	Kyangwali	270	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
6.	Kyangwali	266	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
				10	**2260**	**2034**	
1.	Ryeru	260	1200	3	678	610.2	Maxhamburger
2.	Ryeru	288	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
3.	Ryeru	196	500	1.25	282.5	254.25	Maxhamburger
4.	Ryeru	360	200	1.5	339	305.1	Maxhamburger
5.	Ryeru	465	800	2	452	406.8	Maxhamburger
6.	Ryeru	84	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
7.	Ryeru	890	1200	3	678	610.2	Maxhamburger
8.	Ryeru	900	1200	3	678	610.2	Maxhamburger
9.	Ryeru	390	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger

Name[2]	Subcounty	Trees at monitoring	Total Target	Area (Ha)	tCO2	Saleable 90%	Buyer
10.	Ryeru	388	400	1	226	203.4	Maxhamburger
				17.75	**4011.5**	**3610.35**	
				121.5	**27459**	**24713.1**	
1.	Bitereko	255	400	1	226	203.4	Ceramica Sant'Agostino S.P.A
2.	Bitereko	1000	2000	2.5	565	508.5	Ceramica Sant'Agostino S.P.A
3.	Bitereko	398	800	2	452	406.8	Ceramica Sant'Agostino S.P.A
4.	Bitereko	120	300	0.75	169.5	152.55	Ceramica Sant'Agostino S.P.A
5.	Bitereko	140	400	1	226	203.4	Ceramica Sant'Agostino S.P.A
				7.25	**1638.5**	**1474.65**	
1.	Bitereko	214	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
2.	Bitereko	160	300	0.75	169.5	152.55	Tetrapak
3.	Bitereko	213	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
4.	Bitereko	213	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
5.	Bitereko	159	300	0.75	169.5	152.55	Tetrapak
6.	Bitereko	212	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
7.	Bitereko	210	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
8.	Bitereko	210	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak

Name[2]	Subcounty	Trees at monitoring	Total Target	Area (Ha)	tCO2	Saleable 90%	Buyer
9.	Bitereko	210	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
10.	Bitereko	210	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
11.	Bitereko	208	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
12.	Bitereko	208	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
13.	Bitereko	520	1000	2.5	565	508.5	Tetrapak
14.	Bitereko	207	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
15.	Bitereko	310	600	1.5	339	305.1	Tetrapak
16.	Bitereko	206	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
17.	Bitereko	206	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
18.	Bitereko	203	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
19.	Bitereko	203	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
20.	Bitereko	202	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
21.	Bitereko	202	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
22.	Bitereko	151	300	0.75	169.5	152.55	Tetrapak
23.	Bitereko	151	300	0.75	169.5	152.55	Tetrapak
24.	Bitereko	200	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
25.	Bitereko	200	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
26.	Bitereko	200	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
27.	Bitereko	150	300	0.75	169.5	152.55	Tetrapak
28.	Bitereko	150	300	0.75	169.5	152.55	Tetrapak
29.	Bitereko	200	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
30.	Bitereko	200	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
				30.5	**6893**	**6203.7**	
1.	Bwijanga	553	400	2	452	406.8	Tetrapak

Name[2]	Subcounty	Trees at monitoring	Total Target	Area (Ha)	tCO2	Saleable 90%	Buyer
2.	Bwijanga	276	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
3.	Bwijanga	265	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
4.	Bwijanga	256	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
5.	Bwijanga	202	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
				6	**1356**	**1220.4**	
1.	Kabwoya	200	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
2.	Kabwoya	200	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
3.	Kabwoya	200	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
				3	**678**	**610.2**	
1.	Kanyabwanga	214	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
2.	Kanyabwanga	211	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
				2	**452**	**406.8**	
1.	Kiyanga	210	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
2.	Kiyanga	785	1500	3.75	847.5	762.75	Tetrapak
3.	Kiyanga	412	800	2	452	406.8	Tetrapak
4.	Kiyanga	205	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
5.	Kiyanga	153	300	0.75	169.5	152.55	Tetrapak
6.	Kiyanga	408	800	2	452	406.8	Tetrapak
7.	Kiyanga	201	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
8.	Kiyanga	213	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
				12.5	**2825**	**2542.5**	
1.	Kiziranfumbi	303	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
2.	Kiziranfumbi	280	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
3.	Kiziranfumbi	246	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak

Name[2]	Subcounty	Trees at monitoring	Total Target	Area (Ha)	tCO2	Saleable 90%	Buyer
4.	Kiziranfumbi	484	800	2	452	406.8	Tetrapak
5.	Kiziranfumbi	242	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
6.	Kiziranfumbi	208	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
7.	Kiziranfumbi	115	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
8.	Kiziranfumbi	200	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
9.	Kiziranfumbi	200	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
				10	**2260**	**2034**	
1.	Kyangwali	174	200	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
2.	Kyangwali	840	1000	2.5	226	203.4	Tetrapak
3.	Kyangwali	193	400	1.25	282.5	254.25	Tetrapak
4.	Kyangwali	191	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
				5.75	**960.5**	**864.45**	
1.	Budongo	247	1200	3	678	610.2	Tetrapak
2.	Budongo	100	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
3.	Budongo	140	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
4.	Budongo	206	400	1	226	203.4	Tetrapak
				6	**1356**	**1220.4**	
				75.75	**16780.5**	**15102.5**	
1.	Budongo	319	400	1	226	203.4	U&W-other-10
2.	Budongo	265	400	1	226	203.4	U&W-other-10
3.	Bitereko	291	400	1	226	203.4	U&W-other-10
4.	Kabwoya	400	400	1	226	203.4	U&W-other-10
				4	**904**	**813.6**	
1.	Kiyanga	185	400	1	226	203.4	U&W-other

Name[2]	Subcounty	Trees at monitoring	Total Target	Area (Ha)	tCO2	Saleable 90%	Buyer
2.	Kiyanga	182	400	1	226	203.4	U&W-other
				2	**452**	**406.8**	
1.	Kiziranfumbi	186	400	1	226	203.4	U&W-other
2.	Kiziranfumbi	180	400	1	226	203.4	U&W-other
				2	452	**406.8**	
				4	**904**	**813.6**	
1.	Bitereko	350	400	1	226	203.4	U&W-Coop Denmark-10-(other)
2.	Bitereko	252	400	1	226	203.4	U&W-Coop Denmark-10-(other)
3.	Bitereko	330	600	1.5	339	305.1	U&W-Coop Denmark-10-(other)
4.	Bitereko	219	400	1	226	203.4	U&W-Coop Denmark-10-(other)
5.	Bitereko	217	400	1	226	203.4	U&W-Coop Denmark-10-(other)
6.	Bitereko	217	400	1	226	203.4	U&W-Coop Denmark-10-(other)
7.	Bitereko	215	400	1	226	203.4	U&W-Coop Denmark-10-(other)
				7.5	**1695**	**1525.5**	

Name[2]	Subcounty	Trees at monitoring	Total Target	Area (Ha)	tCO2	Saleable 90%	Buyer
1.	Kiyanga	323	600	1.5	339	305.1	U&W-Coop Denmark-10-(other)
2.	Kiyanga	135	500	1.25	282.5	254.25	U&W-Coop Denmark-10-(other)
				2.75	621.5	559.35	
				10.25	**2316.5**	**2084.85**	
1.	Bitereko	334	400	1	226	203.4	UCB/lifeline
2.	Bitereko	161	300	0.75	169.5	152.55	UCB/lifeline
				1.75	**395.5**	**355.95**	
1.	Ryeru	895	900	**2.25**	**508.5**	**457.65**	Embassy of Denmark
1.	Kicwamba	231	400	1	226	203.4	IIED
2.	Kichwamba	500	500	1.25	282.5	254.25	IIED
3.	Bunyarugurru	600	600	1.5	339	305.1	IIED
				3.75	**847.5**	**762.75**	
1.	Ryeru	107	400	1	226	203.4	Straight PLC
2.	Ryeru	310	600	1.5	339	305.1	Straight PLC
3.	Ryeru	386	500	1.25	282.5	254.25	Straight PLC
4.	Ryeru	299	400	1	226	203.4	Straight PLC
				4.75	**1073.5**	**966.15**	
1.	Kiyanga	580	1200	3	678	610.2	Prior year adjustments

Name[2]	Subcounty	Trees at monitoring	Total Target	Area (Ha)	tCO2	Saleable 90%	Buyer
2.	Kiyanga	214	400	1	226	203.4	Prior year adjustments
3.	Kiyanga	1000	1200	3	678	610.2	Prior year adjustments
4.	Kiyanga	250	500	1.25	282.5	254.25	Prior year adjustments
				8.25	**1864.5**	**1678.05**	
1.	Kichwamba	138	400	1	226	203.4	Prior year adjustments
2.	Kichwamba	171	300	0.75	169.5	152.55	Prior year adjustments
3.	Kichwamba	448	800	2	452	406.8	Prior year adjustments
4.	Kichwamba	195	300	0.75	169.5	152.55	Prior year adjustments
5.	Kichwamba	193	300	0.75	169.5	152.55	Prior year adjustments
6.	Kichwamba	250	400	1	226	203.4	Prior year adjustments
				6.25	**1412.5**	**1271.25**	
1.	Ryeru	615	1200	3	678	610.2	Prior year adjustments
2.	Ryeru	217	400	1	226	203.4	Prior year adjustments
3.	Ryeru	450	600	2	452	406.8	Prior year adjustments
4.	Ryeru	600	400	1	226	203.4	Prior year adjustments

Name[2]	Subcounty	Trees at monitoring	Total Target	Area (Ha)	tCO2	Saleable 90%	Buyer
5.	Ryeru	272	400	1	226	203.4	Prior year adjustments
6.	Ryeru	194	300	0.75	169.5	152.55	Prior year adjustments
7.	Ryeru	220	400	1	226	203.4	Prior year adjustments
8.	Ryeru	229	400	1	226	203.4	Prior year adjustments
9.	Ryeru	800	1400	3.5	791	711.9	Prior year adjustments
				14.25	**3220.5**	**2898.45**	
				28.75	**6497.5**	**5847.75**	
1.	Ryeru	120	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
2.	Ryeru	152	300	0.75	169.5	152.55	Nedbank
3.	Ryeru	160	600	1.5	339	305.1	Nedbank
4.	Ryeru	523	1000	2.5	565	508.5	Nedbank
5.	Ryeru	113	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
6.	Ryeru	900	1600	4	904	813.6	Nedbank
7.	Ryeru	204	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
8.	Ryeru	509	800	2	452	406.8	Nedbank
9.	Ryeru	515	900	2.25	508.5	457.65	Nedbank
10.	Ryeru	400	700	1.75	395.5	355.95	Nedbank
11.	Ryeru	500	800	2	452	406.8	Nedbank
12.	Ryeru	196	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
13.	Ryeru	225	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank

Name[2]	Subcounty	Trees at monitoring	Total Target	Area (Ha)	tCO2	Saleable 90%	Buyer
14.	Ryeru	350	600	1.5	339	305.1	Nedbank
15.	Ryeru	1400	2400	6	1356	1220.4	Nedbank
16.	Ryeru	216	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
17.	Ryeru	635	1200	3	678	610.2	Nedbank
18.	Ryeru	200	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
19.	Ryeru	416	800	2	452	406.8	Nedbank
20.	Ryeru	1315	2600	6.5	1469	1322.1	Nedbank
21.	Ryeru	104	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
22.	Ryeru	155	300	0.75	169.5	152.55	Nedbank
23.	Ryeru	222	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
24.	Ryeru	853	1600	4	904	813.6	Nedbank
25.	Ryeru	318	600	1.5	339	305.1	Nedbank
26.	Ryeru	112	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
27.	Ryeru	82	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
28.	Ryeru	102	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
29.	Ryeru	217	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
30.	Ryeru	350	600	1.5	339	305.1	Nedbank
31.	Ryeru	630	1000	2.5	565	508.5	Nedbank
				59	**13334**	**12000.6**	
1.	Pakanyi	150	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
2.	Pakanyi	400	500	1.25	282.5	254.25	Nedbank
3.	Pakanyi	150	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
4.	Pakanyi	129	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
				4.25	**960.5**	**864.45**	

Name[2]	Subcounty	Trees at monitoring	Total Target	Area (Ha)	tCO2	Saleable 90%	Buyer
1.	Nyangahya	89	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
2.	Nyangahya	500	500	1.5	339	305.1	Nedbank
3.	Nyangahya	115	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
4.	Nyangahya	100	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
				4.5	**1017**	**915.3**	
1.	Muhokya	1600	1600	4	**904**	**813.6**	Nedbank
1.	Maliba	134	400	1.6	361.6	**325.44**	Nedbank
2.	Maliba	313	500	2	452	**406.8**	Nedbank
3.	Maliba	150	400	1	226	**203.4**	Nedbank
4.	Maliba	154	400	1	226	**203.4**	Nedbank
5.	Maliba	259	400	1.2	271.2	**244.08**	Nedbank
6.	Maliba	195	400	1	226	**203.4**	Nedbank
7.	Maliba	200	400	1	226	**203.4**	Nedbank
8.	Maliba	127	400	1	226	**203.4**	Nedbank
9.	Maliba	113	400	10	2260	**2034**	Nedbank
				23.8	**5378.8**	**4840.92**	
1.	Kyangwali	150	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
2.	Kyangwali	102	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
3.	Kyangwali	112	200	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
4.	Kyangwali	105	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
5.	Kyangwali	142	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
6.	Kyangwali	207	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
7.	Kyangwali	112	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
8.	Kyangwali	108	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank

Name[2]	Subcounty	Trees at monitoring	Total Target	Area (Ha)	tCO2	Saleable 90%	Buyer
9.	Kyangwali	107	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
10.	Kyangwali	92	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
11.	Kyangwali	83	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
12.	Kyangwali	50	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
13.	Kyangwali	137	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
14.	Kyangwali	60	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
				14	**3164**	**2847.6**	
1.	Kiziranfumbi	160	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
2.	Kiziranfumbi	180	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
3.	Kiziranfumbi	96	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
4.	Kiziranfumbi	250	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
5.	Kiziranfumbi	246	500	1.25	282.5	254.25	Nedbank
6.	Kiziranfumbi	190	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
7.	Kiziranfumbi	190	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
8.	Kiziranfumbi	188	500	1.25	282.5	254.25	Nedbank
9.	Kiziranfumbi	84	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
10.	Kiziranfumbi	120	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
11.	Kiziranfumbi	120	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
12.	Kiziranfumbi	150	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
13.	Kiziranfumbi	149	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
14.	Kiziranfumbi	256	500	1.25	282.5	254.25	Nedbank
				14.75	**3333.5**	**3000.15**	
1.	Kiyanga	91	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
2.	Kiyanga	122	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank

Name[2]	Subcounty	Trees at monitoring	Total Target	Area (Ha)	tCO2	Saleable 90%	Buyer
3.	Kiyanga	156	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
4.	Kiyanga	82	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
5.	Kiyanga	127	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
6.	Kiyanga	80	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
7.	Kiyanga	156	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
8.	Kiyanga	146	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
9.	Kiyanga	80	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
10.	Kiyanga	163	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
11.	Kiyanga	93	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
12.	Kiyanga	92	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
13.	Kiyanga	143	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
14.	Kiyanga	156	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
15.	Kiyanga	150	300	0.75	169.5	152.55	Nedbank
16.	Kiyanga	89	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
17.	Kiyanga	158	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
18.	Kiyanga	101	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
				17.75	**4011.5**	**3610.35**	
1.	Kigorobya/siiba	169	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
2.	Kigorobya/siiba	250	500	1.25	282.5	254.25	Nedbank
3.	Kigorobya/siiba	200	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
				3.25	**734.5**	**661.05**	
1.	Bwijanga	157	960	2.4	542.4	488.16	Nedbank
2.	Bwijanga	276	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank

Name[2]	Subcounty	Trees at monitoring	Total Target	Area (Ha)	tCO2	Saleable 90%	Buyer
				3.4	**768.4**	**691.56**	
1.	Bugoye	115	400	1	226	203.4	Nedbank
2.	Bugoye	400	600	2.4	542.4	488.16	Nedbank
				3.4	**768.4**	**691.56**	
				148.1	**33470.6**	**30123.54**	
1.	Kichwamba	214	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
2.	Kichwamba	234	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
3.	Kichwamba	231	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
4.	Kichwamba	235	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
5.	Kichwamba	200	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
6.	Kichwamba	478	600	1.5	339	305.1	Ecotrust
7.	Kichwamba	100	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
8.	Kichwamba	92	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
9.	Kichwamba	219	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
10.	Kichwamba	103	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
11.	Kichwamba	243	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
12.	Kichwamba	205	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
13.	Kichwamba	90	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
14.	Kichwamba	100	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
15.	Kichwamba	220	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
16.	Kichwamba	221	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
17.	Kichwamba	208	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
18.	Kichwamba	116	200	0.5	113	101.7	Ecotrust
19.	kichwamba	212	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust

Name[2]	Subcounty	Trees at monitoring	Total Target	Area (Ha)	tCO2	Saleable 90%	Buyer
20.	Kichwamba	178	300	0.75	169.5	152.55	Ecotrust
21.	Kichwamba	213	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
22.	Kichwamba	137	250	0.625	141.25	127.125	Ecotrust
23.	Kichwamba	220	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
24.	Kichwamba	120	200	0.5	113	101.7	Ecotrust
25.	Kichwamba	91	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
26.	Kichwamba	103	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
27.	Kichwamba	209	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
28.	kichwamba	122	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
				26.875	**6073.75**	**5466.375**	
1.	Kabwoya	160	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
2.	Kabwoya	98	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
3.	Kabwoya	102	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
4.	Kabwoya	190	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
5.	Kabwoya	96	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
6.	Kabwoya	112	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
7.	Kabwoya	160	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
8.	Kabwoya	150	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
9.	Kabwoya	100	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
10.	Kabwoya	120	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
11.	Kabwoya	150	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
				11	**2486**	**2237.4**	
1.	Bunyaruguru	1184	2500	6.25	1412.5	1271.25	Ecotrust

Name[2]	Subcounty	Trees at monitoring	Total Target	Area (Ha)	tCO2	Saleable 90%	Buyer
2.	Bunyaruguru	225	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
3.	Bunyaruguru	319	600	1.5	339	305.1	Ecotrust
4.	Bunyaruguru	400	800	2	452	406.8	Ecotrust
5.	Bunyaruguru	102	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
6.	Bunyaruguru	1156	2000	5	1130	1017	Ecotrust
7.	Bunyaruguru	1122	2000	5	1130	1017	Ecotrust
8.	Bunyaruguru	120	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
				22.75	**5141.5**	**4627.35**	
1.	Bugoye	202	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
2.	Bugoye	190	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
3.	Bugoye	215	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
4.	Bugoye	400	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
5.	Bugoye	186	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
				5	**1130**	**1017**	
1.	Budongo	89	400	1	**226**	**203.4**	Ecotrust
1.	Bitereko	165	300	0.75	169.5	**152.55**	Ecotrust
2.	Bitereko	89	400	1	226	**203.4**	Ecotrust
3.	Bitereko	149	300	1	226	**203.4**	Ecotrust
4.	Bitereko	300	1000	2.5	565	**508.5**	Ecotrust
5.	Bitereko	220	600	1.5	339	**305.1**	Ecotrust
6.	Bitereko	120	400	1	226	**203.4**	Ecotrust
7.	Bitereko	86	300	0.75	169.5	**152.55**	Ecotrust
8.	Bitereko	120	400	1	226	**203.4**	Ecotrust
9.	Bitereko	126	300	0.75	169.5	**152.55**	Ecotrust

Name[2]	Subcounty	Trees at monitoring	Total Target	Area (Ha)	tCO2	Saleable 90%	Buyer
10.	Bitereko	95	400	1	226	**203.4**	Ecotrust
11.	Bitereko	93	400	1	226	**203.4**	Ecotrust
12.	Bitereko	140	400	1	226	**203.4**	Ecotrust
				14.25	**3220.5**	**2898.45**	
1.	Ryeru	310	600	1.5	339	305.1	Ecotrust
2.	Ryeru	400	800	2	452	406.8	Ecotrust
3.	Ryeru	90	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
4.	Ryeru	203	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
5.	Ryeru	322	800	2	452	406.8	Ecotrust
6.	Ryeru	270	500	1.25	282.5	254.25	Ecotrust
7.	Ryeru	241	400	1	226	203.4	Ecotrust
				9.75	**2203.5**	**1983.15**	
				89.625	**20255.25**	**18229.73**	

Appendix 2: Verification and monitoring results per district/site-showi numbers monitored and targets

Monitoring Results for Bushenyi, July 2010

No.	Name of Farmer[3]	Site	Period of Monitoring	Acreage (Ha)	No. enur
1		Kiyanga	Year 1	1.5	
2		Kiyanga	Year 1	1.5	
3		Kiyanga	Year 1	1.5	
4		Kiyanga	Year 1	1.25	
5		Kiyanga	Year 1	1.5	
6		Kiyanga	Year 1	1	
7		Kiyanga	Year 1	1	
8		Kiyanga	Year 1	2	
9		Kiyanga	Year 1	2.5	
10		Kiyanga	Year 3	1.5	
11		Kiyanga	Year 3	1	
12		Kiyanga	Year 3	2.5	
13		Kiyanga	Year 1	1	
14		Kiyanga	Year 1	2	
15		Kiyanga	Year 1	1	
16		Kiyanga	Year 1	3	
17		Kiyanga	Year 1	1.5	
18		Kiyanga	Year 1	2.5	
19		Kiyanga	Year 1	1	
20		Kiyanga	Year 0	1	
21		Kiyanga	Year 0	0.8	
22		Kiyanga	Year 0	1	
23		Kiyanga	Year 0	1	
24		Kiyanga	Year 0	1	
25		Kichwamba	Year 1	1	
26		Ryeru	Year 1	1	
27		Kichwamba	Year 1	1	
28		Kichwamba	Year 1	2	
29		Ryeru	Year 1	2	
30		Kichwamba	Year 3	1.5	
31		Kichwamba	Year 3	2.5	
32		Kichwamba	Year 3	2.5	
33		Ryeru	Year 1	1	
34		Ryeru	Year 1	1.25	
35		Ryeru	Year 1	1.5	

[3] Due to data protection rules, the names of participants have been removed from the public version of th

36		Ryeru	Year 1	2	216
37		Ryeru	Year 1	3	656
38		Ryeru	Year 1	3.75	1020
39		Kichwamba	Year 1	2.5	879
40		Kichwamba	Year 1	2.5	551
41		Ryeru	Year 1	2.5	950
42		Bitereko	Year 3	1.5	421
43		Bitereko	Year 3	1	361
44		Bitereko	Year 3	2.5	202
45		Bitereko	Year 3	1	329
46		Bitereko	Year 3	1	560
47		Bitereko	Year 3	2.5	733
48		Bitereko	Year 3	1	300
49		Bitereko	Year 3	2.5	932
50		Bitereko	Year 3	2.5	733
51		Bitereko	Year 3	1	148
52		Bitereko	Year 3	1	223
53		Bitereko	Year 3	1	206
54		Bitereko	Year 3	1	443
55		Bitereko	Year 3	1	257
56		Bitereko		1	229
57		Bitereko	Year 3	1	146
58		Bitereko	Year 3	1	318
59		Bitereko	Year 3	1	155
60		Bitereko	Year 1	2	338
61		Bitereko	Year 1	1	210

Farmers monitored in Bushenyi November 2010

No.	Name	Sub county	Trees enumerated	Period/ contract	Total trees to be planted	Area
1		Bitereko	398	0	800	2
2		Kiyanga	323	0	600	1.5
3		Bitereko	259	3	400	1
4		Bitereko	660	1	1000	2.5
5		Bitereko	300	0	400	1
6		Bitereko	788	1	800	2
7		Bitereko	402	3	400	1
8		Bitereko	89	1	400	1
9		Bitereko	237	0	400	1
10		Bitereko	321	0	400	1
11		Bitereko	240	0	400	1
12		Bitereko	NEWPLOT	0	400	1
13		Bitereko	380	0	600	1.5
14		Bitereko	400	3	500	1.25

15		Kiyanga	182	0	400	1
16		Bitereko	358			
17		Bitereko	302	0	400	1
18		Bitereko	316	0	400	1
19		Bitereko	232	3	400	1
20		Bitereko	342	3	500	1.25
21		Kiyanga	201	0	400	1
22		Bitereko	315	0	400	1
23		Kiyanga	252	0	400	1
24		Kanyabwanga	291	0	400	1
25		Kiyanga	200	0	400	1
26		Bitereko	340	1	400	1
27		Kanyabwanga	391	0	400	1
28		Bitereko	338	3	600	1.5
29		Bitereko	150	3	400	1
30		Bitereko	219	0	400	1
31		Bitereko	214	0	400	1
32		Bitereko	380	0	600	1.5
33		Bitereko	350	0	400	1
34		Bitereko	350	0	400	1
35		Bitereko	217	0	400	1
36		Bitereko	308	3	400	1
37		Bitereko	310	1	400	1

Farmers monitored in January 2011 in Bushenyi

No	Name	Subcounty	Trees monitored	Year
1		Bitereko	382	Yr 1
2		Bitereko	314	Yr 1
3		Bitereko	1170	Yr 1
4		Bitereko	169	Yr 1
5		Bitereko	379	Yr 1
6		Bitereko	475	Yr 1
7		Bitereko	296	Yr 1
8		Bitereko	316	Yr 1
9		Bitereko	492	Yr 1
10		Bitereko	392	Yr 1
11		Bitereko	336	Yr 1
12		Bitereko	259	Yr 1
13		Bitereko	284	Yr 1
14		Bitereko	314	Yr 1
15		Bitereko	268	Yr 1
16		Bitereko	390	Yr 1
17		Bitereko	299	Yr 1
18		Bitereko	234	Yr 1
19		Bitereko	422	Yr 1
20		Bitereko	354	Yr 1
21		Bitereko	299	Yr 1
22		Bitereko	407	Yr 1
23		Kiyanga	501	Yr 1
24		Kiyanga	100	Yr 1
25		Kiyanga	220	Yr 1
26		Kiyanga	400	Yr 1
27		Kiyanga	460	Yr 1
28		Kiyanga	200	Yr 1
29		Kiyanga	157	Yr 1
30		Kiyanga	400	Yr 1
31		Kiyanga	400	Yr 1
32		Kiyanga	354	Yr 1
33		Kiyanga	100	Yr 1
34		Kiyanga	384	Yr 1
35		Kiyanga	440	Yr 1
36		Kiyanga	450	Yr 1
37		Kiyanga	890	Yr 1
38		Kiyanga	278	Yr 1
39		Kiyanga	551	Yr 1
40		Kiyanga	336	Yr 1
41		Kiyanga	138	Yr 1
42		Kiyanga	110	Yr 1
43		Kiyanga	194	Yr 1
44		Kanyabwanga	183	Yr 1
45		Kanyabwanga	347	Yr 1
46		Kanyabwanga	243	Yr 1
47		Kanyabwanga	489	Yr 1
48		Kanyabwanga	221	Yr 1

49		Kichwamba	289	Yr 1
50		Bitereko	Analysis DBH	Yr 5
51		Bitereko	Analysis DBH	Yr 5
52		Bitereko	Analysis DBH	Yr 5
53		Bitereko	Analysis DBH	Yr 5
54		Bitereko	Analysis DBH	Yr 5
55		Bitereko	Analysis DBH	Yr 5
56		Bitereko	Analysis DBH	Yr 5
57		Bitereko	Analysis DBH	Yr 5
58		Bitereko	Analysis DBH	Yr 5
59		Bitereko	Analysis DBH	Yr 5
60		Bitereko	Analysis DBH	Yr 5
61		Bitereko	Analysis DBH	Yr 5
62		Bitereko	Analysis DBH	Yr 5
63		Bitereko	Analysis DBH	Yr 5
64		Bitereko	Analysis DBH	Yr 5
65		Bitereko	Analysis DBH	Yr 5
66		Bitereko	Analysis DBH	Yr 5
67		Bitereko	Analysis DBH	Yr 5
68		Kiyanga	Analysis DBH	Yr 5
69		Kiyanga	Analysis DBH	Yr 5
70		Kiyanga	Analysis DBH	Yr 5
71		Kiyanga	Analysis DBH	Yr 5
72		Kiyanga	Analysis DBH	Yr 5
73		Kiyanga	Analysis DBH	Yr 5
74		Kiyanga	Analysis DBH	Yr 5
75		Kiyanga	Analysis DBH	Yr 5
76		Kiyanga	Analysis DBH	Yr 5

Farmers Monitored in Hoima & Masindi

Name[4]	District	Subcounty	Trees at previous monitoring	Total number to be planted	Trees at 2010 monitoring	Comments
	Hoima	Kiziranfumbi	109	500	693	
	Hoima	Kiziranfumbi	300	600	132	Trees dried due to prolonged drought
	Hoima	Kiziranfumbi	667	1200	171	Trees dried due to prolonged drought
	Hoima	Kiziranfumbi	200	400	468	
	Hoima	Kiziranfumbi	490	600	693	

[4]

	Hoima	Kiziranfumbi	500	500	132	Trees dried due to prolonged drought
	Hoima	Kiziranfumbi	96	400	96	
	Hoima	Kiziranfumbi	150	500	150	
	Hoima	Kiziranfumbi	213	600	213	
	Hoima	Kiziranfumbi	150	500	150	
	Hoima	Kiziranfumbi	213	600	213	
	Hoima	Kiziranfumbi	194	400	194	
	Hoima	Kiziranfumbi	220	500	279	
	Hoima	Kiziranfumbi	208	400	208	
	Hoima	Kiziranfumbi	580	1000	468	
	Hoima	Kyangwali	200	400	408	
	Hoima	Kyangwali	200	400	389	
	Hoima	Kyangwali	400	800	764	
	Hoima	Kiziranfumbi	237	250	253	
	Hoima	Kiziranfumbi	237	250	253	
	Masindi	Budongo	150	400	206	
	Masindi	Budongo	150	400	120	
	Masindi	Budongo	52	1200	247	
	Masindi	Budongo	141	400	149	
	Masindi	Budongo	320	400	400	
	Masindi	Budongo	438	400	445	
	Masindi	Budongo	250	500	50	Trees dried due to poor management and drought
	Masindi	Budongo	130	600	107	Trees dried due to poor management and drought
	Masindi	Budongo	310	400	60	Trees dried due to poor management and drought
	Masindi	Budongo	254	400	60	Trees dried due to poor management and drought
	Masindi	Budongo	110	400	110	
	Masindi	Budongo	350	520	520	
	Masindi	Budongo	125	400	400	
	Masindi	Nyangahya	20	400	50	
	Masindi	Budongo	137	240	300	
	Masindi	Bwijanga	80	400	400	

	Masindi	Bwijanga	309	400	400	
	Masindi	Nyangahya	330	400	0	Farmer cut down the trees and converted land into a sugarcane plantation
	Masindi	Nyangahya	374	400	400	
	Masindi	Nyangahya	825	800	800	
	Masindi	Nyangahya	189	300	200	
	400	Nyangahya	144	400	400	
	400	Nyangahya	350	400	400	