Trees for Global Benefits

2017 Plan Vivo Annual Report

Submitted: 06 March 2018
Approved: 19 June 2018

The Environmental Conservation Trust of Uganda (ECOTRUST)
Contact Person:
Pauline Nantongo Kalunda - Executive Director

Lubowa Housing Estate, Entebbe Road, Kampala
P. O. Box 8986, Kampala, Uganda
Tel/fax +256-31-2266419, Mob 0772 743 562
Email: pnantongo@ecotrust.or.ug
www.ecotrust.or.ug

1. Summary

Project overview	
Reporting period	January to December 2017
Geographical areas	**Albertine Rift** (Rubirizi, Mitooma, Kasese, Hoima, Masindi Districts)) **Mt. Elgon** (Mbale, Manafwa, Bududa, Bulambuli, Sironko Districts)
Technical specifications in use	***Maesopsis Eminii*** *– Original technical specification (applied until 2014)* ***Mixed Native Sp.*** – Approved 1 April 2016. This technical specification comprises three different systems: [1] - Boundary Planting (carbon potential 65.24 tCO_2/ha equivalent to 163.1 tCO2/Km) - Dispersed Interplanting (carbon potential 170.40 tCO_2/ha) - Woodlots (carbon potential 238.80 tCO_2/ha)

Project indicators	**Historical (2003-2016)**	**Added/ Issued this period (2017)**	**Total**
No. smallholder households with PES agreements	5316	788	6104
No. community groups with PES agreements (where applicable) by Dec 2017	81	2	
Approximate number of households (or individuals) in these community groups	262	113	375
Area under management (ha) where PES agreements are in place (includes boundary planting)	5,410.92	556.29	5967.21
Total PES payments made to participants (USD)	$2,171,808.82	$286,473	2,458,281.82
Total sum held in trust for future PES payments (USD)	$1,386,114.20	$147,311.8	1,533,426
Saleable emissions reductions achieved this period (tCO_2)		139,815	
Adjustments corresponding to previous years (tCO_2)		-20,153	
Total saleable emissions reductions (tCO_2)	1,096,372	119,662	1,216,034
Allocation to Plan Vivo buffer account (tCO_2)	121,819	13,296	135,115
Unsold Stock at time of submission (PVC)			
Vintage 2010	1169	-1169	0
Vintage 2013	0	0	0
Vintage 2014	361	-292	69
Vintage 2016	103,253	-6683	96,570
Vintage 2017 (current request)			7,909
Total Unsold Stock (PVC)			104,548
Plan Vivo Certificates (PVCs) issued to date			**1,096,372**
Plan Vivo Certificates requested for issuance (2017 Vintage)			**119,662**
Total PVCs issued (including this report)			**1,216,034**

[1] http://www.planvivo.org/docs/ECOTRUST-Mixed-native-agroforestry-V1.0.pdf

Table of Contents

2. Key Events, Developments and Challenges

Trees for Global Benefits Programme is a cooperative carbon offsetting scheme linking small scale landholding farmers to the voluntary carbon market based on the Plan Vivo standard. TGB, which was initiated in 2003 with 33 farmers in the districts of Rubirizi and Mitooma, works as a Programme of Activities, introducing new communities and new activities into the programme through the development of technical specifications.

Trees for Global Benefit won the 2013 UN SEED Award for being an exceptional social and environmental low carbon enterprise. The Award recognises TGB's achievements in innovation and entrepreneurship so far, its promising efforts to promote economic growth, social development and environmental protection in Uganda, and not least the potential of its partnership to inspire others. The Founding partners of the SEED Initiative are UNEP, UNDP and IUCN. The 2013 Low Carbon SEED Awards were supported by the International Climate Initiative (ICI) of the Germany Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU).

This report covers the progress of implementation of activities for the project year January to December 2017.

2.2 Key Developments

2.1.1 Staff Capacity Building

During the reporting period, Staff involved in Trees for Global Benefit participated in a number of training events. These include Lobby & Advocacy, Gender mainstreaming, Green Finance Modelling, Business engagement, Strategic environmental impact assessment as well as Performance Monitoring Evaluation and Learning. Most of the training has been provided under the IUCN led SRJS Programme in Uganda and it focused on building capacity for ECOTRUST to actively engage with a number of social actors to influence practices. The training focussed on building capacity for staff to harvest the lessons learned to improve performance as well as to contribute to the general development agenda in the country.

2.1.2 Meetings with Local Governments & other Stakeholders

The project held a number of Strategic meetings with District Local Government officials & other stakeholders to support the integration of the TGB farming communities into the District Development Plans. For Mt. Elgon, TGB held a meeting with District Natural Resources Technical Committees of Mbale, Manafwa and Bududa to integrate some of the lessons learned from TGB in enabling the rural poor to participate in REDD initiatives. During the meeting, a Monitoring and Evaluation Framework to monitor the impact of conservation & development initiatives on the poor was reviewed, validated and adopted. The meeting also developed strategies to operationalize the monitoring tool in the District

Local Government conservation initiatives. This activity was supported by the DANIDA funded, IUCN led, Pro-poor & Human Rights – Based Approaches for REDD+

In addition, the TGB initiative was showcased during the annual Mt. Elgon stakeholders' meeting. This is a meeting that brings together all actors in the Mt. Elgon area to share experiences and to develop strategies for improving the management of natural resources in the region

For the Albertine Rift communities, ECOTRUST held meetings with Community Development Officers from Hoima Masindi, Rubirizi, Mitooma and Kasese to support the integration of community priorities as identified in the community visions into the district development initiatives. This process was facilitated by the IUCN Netherlands Committee led programme on Shared Resources Joint Solutions' in Queen Elizabeth and Murchison Falls Landscapes

Table 1; Summary of Trees for Global Benefit Engagement with Stakeholders at Landscape level

Date	Meeting	Venue	Male	Female	Total
29-30/09/17	Mt. Elgon stakeholders' meeting	Mbale			
	Kasese, Rubirizi Mitooma CDO Meeting	Kasese			
29-30/09/17	Hoima Masindi CDO Meeting	Masindi	29	110	139
29-30/09/17	Mt. Elgon Local Government meeting	Mbale	04	19	23
	Total		**33**	**129**	**162**

2.3 Key challenges

2.2.1 Pests & Diseases

Farmers in Rubirizi & Mitooma have continued to experience the challenges with Maesopsis drying up from the top. In addition, Kiyanga sub-county farmers experienced drought that caused some trees to dry. The failure of Maesopsis, which hitherto had been performing very well has discouraged some farmers from the growing of indigenous trees. Some farmers have instead replaced the lost Maesopsis with eucalyptus. Other trees that are having problems in this region include Toona. Farmers have been advised to replace the lost trees with different trees species recommended in the mixed native woodlot species technical specifications, in order to make up for any differences in carbon potentials. In addition, farmers who are finding it difficult to replace all the lost trees have been advised to revise their targets and thus revise agreements to indicate reduced carbon benefits. The lost carbon benefits will be replaced with new farmers once the adjustments have been agreed upon.

In addition to disease, there has been a problem with Termites that has been a major threat to the grevillea species. Normally, with good maintenance of the woodlots through spot weeding, proper pruning and thinning (removal of the diseased trees), the tree stands are able to overcome the pests and diseases. The farmers have therefore been advised to continue maintaining and/or replace the lost trees with different species.

2.2.2 Transition to New Technical Specifications

The project has started the process of supporting farmers that were not performing well to the new technical specifications. The process has been slow since it requires a lot of engagement with the respective farmers, engagement with nursery operators, and local leadership to understand what is going on. The differences between the new and old technical specifications have implications on the expected payments as well as the timing of the payments and require adequate information to be shared with all affected farmers.

2.2.3 Problem Animals

The earliest project sites in Rubirizi & Mitooma Districts have recorded an increase in the number of crop raids from problem animals, particularly elephants. In addition to the project participants experiencing loss, there is a risk of the increase in problem animals to be associated with the project's contribution to biodiversity conservation. The increase in trees makes the environment favourable to these animals, thus attracting them to people's gardens. The project is planning to provide support to farmers to invest in the construction of elephant control trenches along their farms and other methods that reduce problem animals.

2.2.4 Competition with other Tree demands (Eucalyptus)

Native tree woodlots in both Rubirizi and Mitooma districts continue to face competition from the tea industry, which in addition to demanding land has also increased demand for fuelwood (mainly eucalyptus). This was further exacerbated by a local governments' (in all districts) tree planting drive under "Operation Wealth Creation" (OWC). OWC promotes the growing of exotic trees such as Eucaplytus, which competes with the same land as the growing of indigenous trees promoted under the project.

The project has been engaging with the local leadership at the local government, the tree factories as well as with the farmer leaders to support the farmers in these two districts to continue with the planting of native trees.

2.2.5 Prolonged drought

Mitooma District especially Kiyanga Sub-county has continued to experience a number of Environmental challenges such as drought, which has affected tree performance. The distribution of seedlings right at the beginning of the rain season increases the chances of survival and the project is therefore working on improving the timing of seedling distribution. Each farmer group is responsible for seedling acquisition from the respective nursery operators, who are also part of the community.

2.2.6 Misinformation

The project has experienced a number of challenges relating with misinformation from a number of sources, particularly researchers. The numerous lessons generated by the project in various spheres beyond carbon sequestration such as community empowerment, adaptation, micro finance, landscape restoration etc. has continued to attract researchers from within and outside Uganda. Researchers normally have a number of hypotheses that may not necessarily be aligned with the goals of the project. For example, the main focus of the project is to make tree planting a viable livelihood strategy, whereas the goal of most climate justice researchers is to establish whether '*justice is served*'. Most of these researchers do not believe that a smallholder farmer can have a desire for a long-term investment horizon that includes trees. The researchers prefer to engage with

farmers as victims of as opposed to partners in development, making the farmers feel like they are in some exploitative arrangement, leaving them disillusioned and causing some of them to lose interest in the project activities. The farmers that have lost interest in the project have been replaced with new ones corresponding to the 20,153 tCO_2 indicated as adjustments, and corresponding to previous periods.

The project is proud to be contributing to science and to the general body of knowledge but there is a need for this to be done in a manner that ensures that the researchers treat farmers with dignity.

3. Activities, total project size and participation

3.1 Current Technical Specifications

The project has continued to use *Maesopsis eminii* technical specification as well as the Mixed Native Spp. technical specification, in boundary, woodlot and intercropping systems. The farmers recruited prior to 2015 have continued to apply the *Maesopsis eminii* technical specification, whereas the new recruits have applied Mixed Native Spp**.** Where the *Maesopsis eminii* technical specification has failed, farmers are being supported to adopt the new technical specifications without necessarily changing the contract terms.

During the reporting period, the project gave approval to a total of 1,086 farmers expected to bring 895.87 ha of farmland under improved management under using the Mixed Native Spp. technical specification. Approval of *plan vivos* serves as demonstration of the intention to purchase the climate services (emissions removals) generated by the respective *plan vivos*. In addition, the project has continued monitoring the application of *Maesopsis eminii* technical specifications. Table 1 below provides a summary of farmers who were given the go ahead to plant.

Table 2: Total no. farmers given the go-ahead to plant under different Technical Specifications

District	No. of Farmers	Ha to be planted	Target No of Trees to be planted	no of trees monitored	total tCO_2	saleable tCO_2
Mixed Native Woodlot						
Hoima	171	150.1	59721	12466	52705.4	47434.86
Kasese	532	430.5	172200	85736	102803.4	92523.06
Masindi	266	226.2	90480	32377	54016.56	48614.904
Rubirizi	87	87.9	35160	22666	20990.52	18891.468
Mt. Elgon	12	1.168	467.2	262	278.9184	251.02656
TOTAL	**1068**	**895.87**	**358028**	**153507**	**230.794**	**207715.32**
Boundary & Dispersed						
Mt Elgon (dispersed interplanting)	6	1.26	100.8	118	82.215	73.9935
Mt. Elgon (boundary planting)	12	1.587	491.97	368	270.4248	243.38232
Total	**18**	**2.85**	**593**	**486**	**352.64**	**317.38**
GRAND TOTAL	**1086**	**898.72**	**358620.97**	**153993**	**231147.44**	**208032.69**

The details of the number of producers that have been recruited from the different sites are presented in the next chapter.

4. Submission for Plan Vivo Certificate Issuance

During the reporting period, the project has recruited a total of **795** (compared to 832 recruited in 2016) farmers bringing **646.31 ha** in 2016 of farmland under improved management, using the Mixed Native Spp technical specification. The majority of the farmers have continued to come from Kasese District (487 farmers), which accounts for more two thirds of the recruited farmers. Table 3a provides the breakdown per district and sub-county; table 3b gives a breakdown according to technical specifications; and table 3c summarises the overall benefits from this reporting period.

Table 3a: Summary of farmers, per district and sub-county, whose *plan vivos* have been presented for PVC issuance and their performance in achieving the first monitoring target

FARMERS THAT QUALIFIED						
Sub/county	**No. of Farmers**	**Ha to be planted**	**Target No of Trees to be planted**	**no of trees monitored**	**total tCO_2**	**saleable tCO_2**
Mixed Native Woodlot						
Hoima						
Busereka	**2**	**1.5**	**600**	**613**	**358.2**	**322.38**
Kabwoya	**11**	**11**	**4400**	**2189**	**2626.8**	**2364.12**
Kigorobya	9	**8**	**3200**	**2091**	**1910.4**	**1719.36**
Kiziranfumbi	**15**	**14.5**	**5800**	**4475**	**3462.6**	**3116.34**
Kyangwali	**11**	**10.5**	**4200**	**3098**	**2507.4**	**2256.66**
Total Hoima	**48**	**45.5**	**18200**	**12466**	**10865.4**	**9778.86**
Kasese						
Bugoye	119	100.00	40000.00	25175.00	23880.00	21492.00
Karusandara	18	13.50	5400.00	2556.00	3223.80	2901.42
Maliba	191	157.50	63000.00	32462.00	37611.00	33849.90
Rukoki	159	118.30	47320.00	24584.00	28250.04	25425.04
Total Kasese	**487**	**389.30**	**155720**	**84777**	**92964.84**	**83668.36**
Masindi						
Budongo	39	31.80	12720.00	8500.00	7593.84	6834.46
Bwijanga	40	36.80	14720.00	7842.00	8787.84	7909.06
Karujubu	24	18.80	7520.00	4898.00	4489.44	4040.50
Nyangahya	18	16.80	6720.00	3109.00	4011.84	3610.66
Pakanyi	24	21.50	8600.00	5772.00	5134.20	4620.78
Total Masindi	**145**	**125.7**	**50280**	**30121**	**30017.16**	**27015.44**
Rubirizi						
Ryeru	87	87.90	351160.00	22666.00	20990.52	18891.47
Total Rubirizi	**87**	87.90	351160	22666	20990.52	18891.47
Mt. Elgon	10	0.67	267.20	201.00	159.52	143.57
Total Mt. Elgon	**10**	**0.67**	**267.20**	**201.00**	**159.52**	**143.57**
Mixed Native Woodlot TOTAL	**777.00**	**649.07**	**259627.20**	**150231.00**	**154997.44**	**139497.69**

Mixed Native Boundary planting						
Manafwa	6	1.26	100.8	118	82.215	73.9935

Mixed Native Boundary TOTAL	**6**	**1.26**	**100.8**	**118**	**82.215**	**73.9935**
Mixed Native Dispersed Interplanting						
Bukusu	12	1.59	491.97	368.00	270.42	243.38
Mixed Native Dispersed interplanting TOTAL	**12**	**1.59**	**492**	**368**	**270.42**	**243.38**
GRAND TOTAL ALL	**795.00**	**651.92**	**260219.97**	**150717.00**	**155350.08**	**139815.20**

Table 3b: Summary of issuance per technical specification

	No. of Farmers	Ha to be planted	Target No of Trees to be planted	no of trees monitored	total tCO_2	saleable tCO_2
Mixed Native Spp Woodlot	777	649.07	259627.20	150231	154997.44	139497.69
Mixed Native Spp Boundary planting	6	1.26	101	118	82.215	73.9935
Mixed Native Spp Dispersed Interplanting	12	1.587	492	368	270.4248	243.38232

Table 3c: Summary of Plan Vivo Certificate (PVC) issuance request

Qualified total (tCO_2)	155,350
Total saleable (tCO_2)	139,815
Set aside for buffer allocation & replacements (tCO_2)	15,535
Prior year adjustments (tCO_2)	20,153
Saleable tCO_2 available for issuance (90%)	119,662
Final buffer allocation to be made this period	13,296

5. Sales of Plan Vivo Certificates

During the annual reporting period (2017), the project has sold 119,907 tCO_2 (up from 29,451 tCO_2 in 2016) to various buyers as indicated in table 4a below. This includes 111,753 tCO_2 from new issuances (vintage 2017), and 8,144 tCO_2 from existing vintages of stock.

Table 4a: Sales for the reporting period January to December 2017

Vintage	Name of purchaser/ source of funds	No. PVCs purchased	Price per Certificate	Total amount received ($)
2017	ZeroMission Max	57,092		
2017	ZeroMission Max	50,121		
2017	Uganda Carbon Bureau	52		
2017	ZeroMission	1,520		
2017	ZeroMission	2,200		
2017	ZeroMission	768		
Subtotal		**111,753**		
2014	COTAP	292		
2010	COTAP	1,169		
2016	ZeroMission	3,400		
2016	ZeroMission	3,283		
Subtotal		**8,144**		
Total sales in 2017		**119,907**		

NB/ Individual pricing information supplied to the Foundation is for internal purposes only.

Total sales of Plan Vivo Certificates stands at 1,111,486 tCO_2 broken down as follows:

Table 4b: Total Number of Certificates sold since project inception

Year	tCO_2	Price/tCO_2 ($)	Total Price ($)
Pre-2008	59,093	4.37	258,186.47
2008	80,428	5.92	476,468.21
2009	38,700	6.51	251,773.80
2010	80,896	6.07	491,302.23
2011	82,298	5.63	463,149.18
2012	148,411	5.11	758,637.15
2013	34,598	5.96	206,170.20
2014	179,872	5.93	1,066,073.40
2015	257,842	5.91	1,523,937.30
2016	29,451	5.82	171,340.10
2017	119,897	5.94	711,996.11
Total	**1,111,486**	**$ 5.74**	**$ 6,379,034.15**

For a full sales record, with respective volumes, see Appendix I. Below is the list of *unsold stock* for vintages 2014 to 2017 at 31 December 2017.

Table 4c: Number of Certificates available for sale.

Vintage	No. of PVCs
2014	69
2016	96,570
2017	7,909
Total	**104,548 PVC**

6. Summary of Monitoring Results

6.1 Monitoring of Carbon Benefits

TGB uses an activity-based (*ex ante*) system in which simple models are used to predict the expected carbon benefits. Through the development of technical specifications, the project describes the agreed activities that are conservatively expected to generate the modelled Environmental Services. The project has continued to monitor farmer performance against the agreed indicators as published in the technical specifications. This was conducted through field visits to the farms through which the number of trees planted, the stocking density, the area of land managed and type of tree species planted were recorded.

In addition to assessing the tree survival rates and growth rates, this field – based activity also continues to measure the size of land per plan vivo and Provides extension services & Interact with farmers.

The results of the monitoring exercise were discussed with the monitoring team, farmer facilitators, as well as the farmers during follow up meetings with the groups. The discussion with the farmer groups was intended to generate information that would be useful in understanding why some farmers never go beyond the first milestones despite their continued engagement with the programme.

6.1.1 General Performance

A total of 3,181 continuing farmers were visited in Mitooma (403) & Rubirizi (598), Hoima (312), Masindi (355), Mt. Elgon (208) and Kasese (1,305). Out of these 3,084 farmers, 2,061 farmers met their targets while 1,120 did not meet these targets. There has been an improvement from last year's performance of (59.5%) to 65% of the farmers meeting their respective targets.

6.1.2 Rubirizi / Mitooma

In Rubirizi & Mitooma, the oldest project site, a total of 1,003 farmers were visited and their gardens monitored. As earlier reported, this was the project pilot site, farmers therefore were faced with challenges and the lessons from these challenges generated the information that was used to develop the most recent technical specifications. The main project initiatives in this area are therefore focusing on improving performance by supporting the migration to the new technical specifications.

The process has been much faster in Rubirizi where the number of farmers that are currently on track lies at Eighty two per cent (82%) of the total number of farmers visited. Rubirizi has been the best performing district for the reporting period (2017). This is mainly due to the existing collaboration between the project and the National Forest Authority (NFA), in which farmers have been allocated the degraded part of Kalinzu Central Forest Reserve in Ryeru Sub-county under Collaborative Forest Management Arrangement. In addition to the CFM agreement attracting additional Support from partners such as WWF & NFA, the allocation of land in a protected area ensures that the trees are not in any way competing with any other land use. The terms of this

particular CFM agreement are conducive to native tree planting. Moreover, the agreement has conditionalities that serve as additional incentives that further strengthen adherence to the carbon agreement.

Mitooma farmers on the other hand have been slow at adjusting to the new technical specifications. By the end of the first monitoring, only forty two per cent (48%) of farmers visited in Mitooma (Kiyanga, Bitereko & Kanyabwanga) had met their targets. The Kiyanga farmers were later supported to transition to the new technical specifications with 41 farmers out of the 92 farmers in Kiyanga that had not been on target, reported to have filled the gaps based on the new technical specifications. This is close to half of the farmers whose gardens were performing poorly in this sub-county and the project will visit these farmers in early 2018 to confirm the survival. The main focus in Mitooma District for 2018 will therefore be supporting the transition of farmers in Bitereko sub-county. Mitooma has some of the best success stories where farmers have generated a number of lessons that attract researchers. They are the therefore the same farmers that have been most affected by the misinformation from researchers.

Environmental challenges such as drought are the main reason the earlier technical specifications failed in Mitooma. However, the delays in adopting the revised technical specifications is due to other factors such as misinformation from a number of sources, including researchers. There has also been an increase in problem animal incidences, however, these are mainly in Kiyanga and they mainly destroy other crops and not the trees.

Moreover, native tree woodlots in both Rubirizi and Mitooma districts continue to face competition from the tea industry, which has increased demand for fuelwood (mainly eucalyptus). Even then, Rubirizi is performing better since the CFM agreement conditions do not allow the farmers to grow Eucalypts in the Central Forest Reserve. All the above threats seem to disfavour Mitooma. It is however expected that the project's current engagement with the tree factories, local government as well as with the farmer leaders will enable the farmers in these two districts (particularly Mitooma) to adjust to the new technical specifications, which will enable them to meet targets.

Table 4a: Performance of continuing farmers in Mitooma based on the First monitoring results

	Number of Farmers Meeting Target		
Sub-county	**Yes**	**No**	**Total**
Bitereko	67	110	177
Kanyabwanga	12	3	15
Kiyanga	119	92	211
TOTAL	**198**	**205**	**403**
	49%	51%	

Table 4b: Performance of continuing farmers in Rubirizi based on the monitoring results

Sub-county	**Yes**	**No**	**Total**
Katanda	50	10	60
Katerera	13	2	15
Kichwamba	118	24	142
Kirugu	2	1	7
Kyabakara	4	1	5
Magambo	0	1	1
Rubirizi T Council	1	0	1
Ryeru	301	66	367
	489	**105**	**598**
	82%	18%	

6.1.3 Hoima

A total of 312 farmers have been monitored and the number of farmers on track (either met target or need some gap filling) has improved from last year's 33% (172 out of 520) to 58% (180 out of 312). The majority of the farmers that were monitored are still using the *Maesopsis eminii* technical specifications and need to be supported to migrate to the Mixed Native technical specifications. All farmers have expressed interest in continuing with the project and they will be supported during the year 2018, to meet their targets. The process of migrating to the new technical specifications may require the majority of farmers that are currently failing to meet their targets to reduce land currently under the project to manageable levels. The community visioning exercise as well as engagement with local government has been the main reason for the improvements. The table below summarises the

Table 4c: Performance of continuing farmers in Hoima, based on the monitoring results

	Summary of Farmer Performance per Year of Monitoring				
Year of Monitoring	**0**	**1**	**3**	**5**	
Status			**No. of Farmers**		
Met Target	9	63	39	41	152
Need to Fill Gaps	0	1	5	22	**28**
Need to Reduce Target	5	23	48	56	**132**
TOTAL	**14**	**87**	**92**	**119**	**312**

6.1.4 Masindi

A total of 355 farmers have been monitored and 63% (222 out of 355) of the farmers were found to be on track (have either met the target or have a few gaps to fill). The gap filling process is still very slow among farmers in year 3. The majority of farmers that have failed to meet targets are farmers that have failed to move from the year0 target. Negotiations are being conducted with these farmers to reduce land currently under the project to manageable levels. We have also had some cases of farmers selling their farms. However, during our community engagements most of the new owners have expressed interest in continuing with the project. The table below summarises the performance for Masindi District

Table 4d: Performance of continuing farmers in Masindi, based on the monitoring results

	Farmer Performance per Year of Monitoring				
Year of Monitoring	**0**	**1**	**3**	**5**	
Status			**No. of Farmers**		
Met Target		46	47	64	157
Need to Fill Gaps		7	47	11	65
Need to Reduce Target		78	36	19	133
TOTAL	**0**	**131**	**130**	**94**	**355**
					63%

6.1.5 Kasese

A total of 1,353 farmers have been monitored and generally speaking farmers in this district were found to be on track with 66% of the farmers meeting targets and 34% requiring a bit of gap filling. These are usually the best performing farmers although they continue to experience drought, fires,

termites and diseases. The strong leadership under the community-based organisation is the main reason these farmers continue to perform very well.

Table 4 e: Summary of Farmer Performance per Year of Monitoring in Kasese District

Year of Monitoring	0	1	3	5	7	TOTAL	%age
Target Met	23	483	245	138	0	**889**	**66%**
Gap Filling	18	236	122	87	1	**464**	**34%**
TOTAL	**41**	**719**	**367**	**225**	**1**	**1353**	

6.1.6 Mt. Elgon

A total of 202 farmers have been monitored and 73% (148 out of 202) of the farmers were found to be on track. These are the best performing farmers for the year and this could be attributed to the additional support in form of community visioning. In addition, the numbers here continue to be few, making it significantly easier for the assigned coordinator to follow up.

Table 4f: Performance of continuing farmers in Mt. Elgon based on the 2017 monitoring results

Sub-county	Yes	No	Total
Bududa	22	14	36
Bulambuli	62	0	62
Manafwa	11	23	34
Mbale	39	32	71
Sironko	42	1	5
	176	**70**	**208**
	84.6%	15.4%	

6.2 Monitoring of Socio-economic Impact

The project is expected to improve community well-being by contributing to reducing the number of poor households. The project was designed to contribute to poverty reduction through a number of approaches. The table below presents a summary of the project's current contribution to selected socio-economic aspects.

Social Dimension	Indicator	Value
1. Livelihoods	• Per capita income as a result of PVC sales	$546.86
2. Jobs	• Number of employees, hired by the project full-time (men/women)	22
	• Number of employees, hired by the project-part-time (men/women)	69
	• Number of Village Savings & Loans Associations supported by TGB	21
	• Number of commercial nurseries supported by TGB	22

3. Tenure Security	• Number of communal ownership titles	1
	Area covered under communal ownership	193

Governance Dimension	Indicator	Value
Social capital	• Number of community groups created and/or supported by the Project	68
	• Number of community meetings supported by the Project	39
	• Number of participants in community meetings supported by the Project	1932
Project governance	• ECOTRUST Financial Audits carried out (internal & External audits)	5
	• No of project meetings with Farmer Groups, & farmer Coordinators	39
	• Number of ECOTRUST Board of Trustees meetings	4

A list of community owned businesses including Village Savings & Loans' Associations, commercial nursery operations as well as community-based organisations that have received support from the project are presented in Appendix II

6.3 Monitoring of Environmental Co-Benefits

The project also looks at measuring its impacts in terms of climate change adaptation, biodiversity enhancement, watershed services and renewable energy. The table below presents a summary of the project's current contribution to selected environmental co-benefits.

Environmental Dimension	Indicator	Value
1. Biodiversity conservation	• % of indigenous tree species planted (as opposed to naturalized species)	79%
2. Protected areas conservation	• No of protected areas covered by project	9
3. Catchment condition	• List of catchments improved by the programme	7
4. Climate resilience	• No of HH with improved adaptation strategies	6104

7. PES update

7.1 PES Transfers

The project has continued to pay all producers that have complied with the minimum requirements following monitoring activities. Payments to farmers are made through their respective Banks, mobile phone and/or Village SACCOs/ Financial institutions where they hold individual accounts. For the reporting period, ECOTRUST has scaled up the use of the mobile money platform to make direct payments to farmers SACCO or banks accounts or directly of farmers mobile telephones. The Beyonic mobile platform enables ECOTRUST to transact from the project bank accounts to the Beyonic mobile platforms and then to the respective mobile phones. A total of USD $286,473 has been distributed to the farmers in the various districts through these facilities and an additional $USD 47,876 given in form of seedlings.

Tables 5a & 5b below show payment disbursements to farmers and seedling suppliers of the various project sites respectively. The tables indicate if the payments were made through SACCOs or through the mobile money platform (Beyonic).

Table 5a: Summary of payments to producers in 2017

Date	Details	Amount ($USD)
17/01/2017	Masindi farmer payments	2,526.37
17/01/2017	Hoima farmer payment	773.11
18/01/2017	Masindi farmer payments	406.78
28/02/2017	Bushenyi farmer payments	27,082.01
25/04/2017	Masindi Yr0 and Hoima Yr0 farmer payment through Beyonic	10,630.15
19/05/2017	Masindi farmer payments yr0	1,112.48
05/03/2017	Hoima farmer payment yr0	1,397.25
05/03/2017	Masindi farmer payment yr0	1,431.36
05/02/2017	Masindi farmer payment yr0	971.34
05/02/2017	Masindi farmer payments yr0	908.60
05/02/2017	Masindi farmer payment yr0	997.80
05/02/2017	Masindi farmer payment yr0	1,557.62
05/02/2017	Masindi farmer payments yr0	835.14
07/11/2017	Mbale farmer payments without bank A/cs and not in the SAACOs	2,997.58
27/07/2017	Mbale farmer payments	790.69
27/07/2017	Mbale farmer payments	1,044.96
27/07/2017	Mbale farmer payments	221.45
26/07/2017	Mbale farmer payments	461.08
25/07/2017	Bushenyi farmer payments (Bitereko, Kyamuhunga, Rutookye)	7,916.11
23/08/2017	Mbale farmer payment	169.69
25/08/2017	Mbale farmer payment for Musamali Damascus	26.06
23/08/2017	Kiyanga farmer payments (Rutookye and Kyamuhunga people's SAACO)	5,764.69
19/09/2017	Mbale farmer payments (Bulambuli and Sironko)	524.29
19/09/2017	Mbale farmer payments (Bulambuli and Sironko)	47.76
24/10/2017	Mbale farmer payments	2,294.15
30/11/2017	Kasese farmer payments (Maliba and Bugoye)	11,364.63

30/11/2017	Payments to farmers under TGB in Kichwamba, Ryeru and Katerera	22,233.36
30/11/2017	Kasese farmer payments (Maliba and Bugoye)	4,811.44
11/01/2017	Farmer payments to Katanda farmers (Kyamuhunga SAACO)	5,574.71
11/01/2017	Payment to Ryeru farmers (Bunyaruguru SAACO)	6,411.95
11/01/2017	Payment to TGB katanda farmers through Rutookye SAACO	273.39
30/11/2017	Kasese farmer payments through Kilembe Inter community SAACO	1,529.27
31/12/2017	Masindi farmer payment	13,706.63
25/12/2017	Masindi farmer payment for farmers not in SACCOs	1,642.78
23/12/2017	Kasese farmer payment in four sites (Maliba, Karusandara, Bugoye, Rukoki and Kitswamba)	69,498.53
23/12/2017	Mbale and Hoima farmer payments paid through beyonic	21,183.53
23/12/2017	Rubirizi carbon farmers through Bunyaruguru SAACO	7,478.94
		238,597.68

Table 5b: Amount for seedlings received by producers in 2017

Date	Site	Amount (UGX)	Amount ($USD)
25/01/2017	Hoima	366,000	104.57
25/01/2017	Masindi	4,282,560	1,223.59
25/01/2017	Hoima	364,500	104.14
25/01/2017	Hoima	391,800	111.94
27/01/2017	Kasese	2,490,000	711.43
27/01/2017	Kasese	1,051,800	300.51
27/01/2017	Kasese	2,707,500	773.57
25/01/2017	Hoima	420,000	120.00
25/01/2017	Masindi	649,500	185.57
02/09/2017	Masindi	1,506,000	430.29
25/04/2017	Kasese	10,562,300	3,017.80
25/04/2017	Kasese	11,200,000	3,200.00
06/08/2017	Kasese	1,890,000	540.00
06/08/2017	Masindi	7,385,000	2,110.00
06/08/2017	Masindi	1,900,500	543.00
06/08/2017	Masindi	4,189,500	1,197.00
06/08/2017	Kasese	5,494,650	1,569.90
06/08/2017	Kasese	7,873,950	2,249.70
06/08/2017	Kasese	6,062,000	1,732.00
15/08/2017	Manafwa	579,950	165.70
10/10/2017	Kasese	4,526,700	1,293.34
17/10/2017	Kasese	4,800,000	1,371.43
24/10/2017	Kasese	2,354,850	672.81
24/10/2017	Kasese	8,575,000	2,450.00
11/01/2017	Kasese	20,510,000	5,860.00
30/11/2017	Masindi	810,000	231.43
30/11/2017	Masindi	3,165,000	904.29
30/11/2017	Masindi	814,500	232.71
30/11/2017	Masindi	3,179,500	908.43
30/11/2017	Hoima	3,402,750	972.21
30/11/2017	Hoima	3,146,500	899.00
30/11/2017	Masindi	485,000	138.57

30/11/2017	Hoima	1,122,100	320.60
30/11/2017	Masindi	645,000	184.29
30/11/2017	Kasese	3,077,000	879.14
01/08/2018	Kasese	3,468,000	990.86
01/08/2018	Kasese	3,654,000	1,044.00
01/08/2018	Kasese	4,134,000	1,181.14
01/09/2018	Kasese	9,730,000	2,780.00
01/08/2018	Kasese	5,029,500	1,437.00
01/08/2017	Rubirizi	9,570,050	2,734.30
		167,566,960	**47,876**

7.2 Carbon Community Fund

Table 6a below represents the groups whose proposals for CCF were disbursed during the reporting period (For further details on this fund, please refer to the updated PDD on the Plan Vivo website).

Table 6a: List of CCF groups whose payments for grants approved in 2016 were disbursed

#	Organisation / Association	District	Subcounty	Proposal	Required (UGX)	ECOTRUST Contribution (UGX)	Farmers contribution (UGX)
1	Ruboni Community Conservation and development	Kasese	Bugoye	Tree nursery	6,200,000	5,000,000	1,200,00
2	Mobuku integrated farmers association (MIFA)	Kasese	Mobuku	Kick kerosene lamps out of Mobuku	8,910,000	5,000,000	Community: 1,500,000 MIFA: 2,410,000
3	Kilembe Inter community based organization for development	Kasese	Kilembe	Bee keeping project	5,053,000	4,050,000	1,003,000

For the reporting period, the addition CCF disbursements that have been approved were based on the farmers requested for support in silvicultural equipment. It was agreed that every group of 100 farmers will be facilitated with a kit including; pruning saws, Machete, measuring tapes, diameter tapes, sunto, GPS, handsaw etc. This brings the total number of equipment kits to be delivered to 60 (Sixty)

8. Ongoing Community Participation

8.1 Introduction

The TGB programme recognizes that continuously building social capital and facilitation of knowledge / experience sharing in order is key to the overall success of this program. The TGB project held participatory farmer trainings/sensitization meetings in all the sub counties/districts, where TGB is implemented. The main issues discussed in the training sessions and meetings include global warming, the plan vivo cycle, tree planting and carbon management. Farmers also discuss the challenges and threats in the community and jointly come up with possible solutions. During the reporting period, the project conducted farmer training sessions and meetings. This section highlights some of the issues discussed in these meetings.

8.2 Farmer Organisations' Capacity Building

The capacity building initiatives for the year focused on the strengthening of leadership structures as well as the mainstreaming of gender in the Community – Based Organisations' initiatives. The activities included facilitating the TGB farmer groups in Mt. Elgon to finalise constitutions and elect farmer leaders. One of the groups has been able to develop a concept and access financial support from the Local Government for selected initiatives towards the implementation of their constitutions. This activity was supported by the DANIDA funded, IUCN led, Pro-poor & Human Rights – Based Approaches for REDD+.

In addition, Exemplary female leaders and farmers were identified in the Albertine Rift Districts of Rubirizi, Mitooma, Kasese, Hoima & Masindi and held focused group discussions to suggest ways of improving women participation in the programme. In addition, an exchange visit was organised for the Queen Elizabeth communities to share experiences with those around Murchison Falls. The field visit focussed on food security and gender mainstreaming. Previously annual meetings were organised for farmer leaders but these were mainly dominated by men. The meeting enabled us to identify the potential we have in working with women in lobby, identified key issues that were affecting women and these include securing land tenure. This exchange visit facilitated by the SRJS programme enabled the women to meet, learn and discuss through an exposure visit to Hoima.

Table 7a: Farmer Owned CBO Capacity Building

Date	District	Sub county	Male	Female	Total
29-30/09/17	Mbale constitution meeting	Wanale,	13	41	54
		Nyondo,	15	59	74
	Total		**28**	**100**	**128**
29-30/09/17	Manafwa constitution meeting	Bukusu,	03	20	23
	Total		**59**	**220**	**279**
29-30/09/17	Bududa constitution meeting	Nakatsi,	13	26	39
		Bukibokolo	19	27	46
	Total		**150**	**493**	**643**
	Albertine Rift women exchange visit				

Table 7b: Farmer Leaders' Planning Meetings

Date	Meeting	Venue	Male	Female	Total
21/07/17	TGB Monitoring Feedback Meeting	Bitereko	20	18	38
21/07/17	TGB Monitoring Feedback Meeting	Kiyanga	25	20	45
Sept 2017	Farmer Leaders Annual General Meeting	Entebbe	40	16	56
Sept 2017	Improved Cookstoves Promotion Meeting	Lubowa	40	16	56
	Total		**125**	**70**	**195**

8.3 Community Visioning

Based on the experience from the Mt. Elgon area the project extended to community visioning, an activity process to the districts of Kasese, Rubirizi, Mitoona Masindi and Hoima regions. These community visioning sessions were supported by the IUCN NL – led SRJS programme in Uganda and they focus on empowering farmers in aspects of group formation at the level of farmer recruitment, mainly to allow farmers with small land holdings to participate in the project activities. 20 communities were facilitated to develop community visions that are being used as engagement tools with the local government. The plans are intended to guide these communities to actively participate in district level planning processes. This process was facilitated by the IUCN Netherlands Committee led programme on Shared Resources Joint Solutions' in Queen Elizabeth and Murchison Falls Landscapes

Table 7c: Summary of participation in the Community Visioning Meetings

Date	District	Sub county	Male	Female	Total
5th-8thApril 2017	Hoima	Kyangwali	63	6	69
		Kabwoya	26	22	48
		Kiziranfumbi	29	14	43
		Kigorobya	23	0	23
	Total		**141**	**42**	**183**
28-30/03/17	Kasese	Ruboni	17	48	65
		Kilembe	25	32	57
		Maliba	19	47	66
		Bugoye	47	152	199
	Total		**390**	**363**	**753**
31/05/17	Rubirizi	Ryeru	8	24	32
		Kichwamba	13	47	60
	Mitooma	Katereera	3	36	39
		Bitereko	5	22	27
	Total		**809**	**855**	**1664**
	Masindi	Nyangahya	18	36	54
		Nyantozi/ Budongo	05	68	73
		Alimugonza	06	29	35

		Bwijanga	09	64	73
23-27/10/17	Masindi	Nyanghaya	39	40	79
	Total		**1695**	**1947**	**3642**
	Hoima	Kigorobya	18	2	20
		Kabwoya	12	4	16
		Kyangwali	56	3	59
	Total	Kiziranfumbi	42	7	49
		Kaseeta	23	4	27
23-27/10/17	Hoima	Buseruka	13	27	40
		Kabwoya	9	46	55
		Kiziranfumbi	12	38	50
		Kyangwali	03	41	44
		Kigorobya	51	10	61
Totals			**88**	**162**	**250**

Table 7d: Summary of Induction Meetings for new farmers

Date	District	Sub county	Male	Female	Total
5th-8thApril 2016	Manafwa	Bukusu	11	27	38
	Total		**11**	**27**	**38**

8.4 Progress on addressing issues raised previously

8.4.1 Evidence-based Advocacy

With support from the IUCN Netherlands Committee under the Shared Resources, Joint Solutions Programme, ECOTRUST launched an evidence – based advocacy programme that involves farmers in the safeguarding of International Public Goods in the landscapes of Murchison Falls & Queen Elizabeth Conservation Areas.

The advocacy campaign is a response to the escalation of threats to forest conservation in the Budongo – Bugoma landscape, which is one of the most forested areas in Uganda. The main drivers include oil and gas developments, sugarcane cultivation, etc.

The advocacy campaign has enabled ECOTRUST to engage with stakeholders from the local to national & international level. This has resulted into the formation of several partnerships, such as with NTV, Uganda's leading private TV station, where all our conservation partners receive a 40% discount on the commercial rates.

8.4.2 Monitoring

One of the key challenges in 2016 was that the growing number of smallholders and scattered landholdings increased the burden of monitoring. The main strategy has been the identification and engagement of local – based experts for the monitoring. The project identified and engaged a number of local experts, who are not farmers but live in the project sites to offer short term technical assistance in the area of monitoring. This is expected to reduce on the cost of monitoring

8.4.3 Technical Specifications

Some of the smallholders that had been recruited during the initial years have been having challenges meeting the project targets. This was mainly because they were implementing activities that had been technically specified during the pilot years of the project. These farmers have generated sufficient information on which activities work best in which areas, which resulted into the development of new technical specifications. The project has therefore embarked on the process of supporting the farmers that have been experiencing challenges to migrate to the new technical specifications. This has started with oldest site of Rubirizi & Mitooma. The project will in 2018 focus on Mitooma, Hoima & Masindi

8.4.4 Landholdings

One of the key challenges in 2016 was that the growing number of smallholders and scattered landholdings increased the burden of monitoring. The main strategy has been the identification and engagement of locally based monitoring experts. The number of farmers with smaller land sizes has continued to grow. However, the project has developed a number of strategies to enable these farmers to participate while minimizing the impact on transaction costs. The strategies revolve around group recruitment – where farmers in an area apply and are recruited as a group. This reduces the time spent in between farms. With the implementation of farmer group recruitment in the whole Mt. Elgon Landscape, the number of farmers and land under improved management is likely to increase and assistant farmer coordinators at parish level will help in extension of the program to other farmers.

Training in tree based enterprises: The project will invest in activities that build capacity for managing tree – based enterprises. This activity will mainly focus on farmers that are in Yr5 and beyond.

8.4.5 Timeliness of payments

Delays in payments as a result of the long time spent processing farmer payments had earlier on been identified as one of the issues that have been demotivating farmers. The main reasons for the delays in payments include the amount of time spent analysing the monitoring information as well as the inability of some farmers to get access to financial institutions (including micro finance). The project has subscribed to a Mobile App based system (Beyonic) through which farmers can be paid using mobile money. In addition, an additional mobile App has been developed to support the management of monitoring information. The App will be used to support real time submission of farmer information to the database. The use of mobile devices is expected to significantly reduce the turnaround time for processing monitoring results that lead to the payments.

8.4.6 Updating farmer information

Farmers & farmer coordinators have been requesting an improvement in feedback on how the project is performing generally. Normally, the project shares performance information during the annual farmer representatives meetings. Once a year was deemed insufficient. The farmers requested that meetings should be held to discuss the results of the recently concluded monitoring with each individual farmer's performance and the implications in terms of expected payments and the areas of improvement for each individual farmer. The project has therefore started holding feedback meetings, during which performance at the sub-county level is discussed. However, the individual farmer performance feedback is delivered to the individual farmers. The project has designed farmer information booklets, where any changes regarding the farmer status resulting from the monitoring can be updated on a regular basis.

9. Breakdown of Operational Costs

Below is a breakdown of all operational costs connected to the project for the reporting period: The level of co-funding has improved from the USD $184,309 contributed by various donors in 2016 to USD$ 271,695. The majority of co-funding came from the Dutch Government through the Netherlands Committee of IUCN

Table 8. Breakdown of operational costs

2017 costs	Total Cost ($)	Carbon sales ($)	Other sources ($)	Notes
3rd party Verification	$12,357.75	$6,830.99	$5,526.76	IUCN NL
Staff time	$198,718.76	$62,458.96	$136,259.80	IUCN NL, IUCN UCO, internal sources
Farmer capacity building	$10,384.11	$2,146.48	$8,237.63	
Monitoring	$38,759.65	$9,405.83	$29,353.82	
Office running costs	$110,218.85	$75,029.85	$35,189.00	IUCN NL, IUCN UCO, internal sources
Vehicle running costs	$18,968.31	$2,737.72	$16,230.59	
Research & Project Development	$28,881.03		$28,881.03	
Coordinators	$6,219.72	$6,219.72		IUCN NL, IUCN UCO,
Other travel	$12,216.79	$199.55	$12,017.24	
TOTALS	**$436,724.97**	**$165,029.09**	**$271,695.87**	

The monitoring costs have continued to be high but this is because there was a lot of capacity building for the community – based monitors. It is expected that once these monitors have been grounded in the project requirements, the cost of monitoring will go down.

10. Future Development

10.1 Third Party Verification

In addition to the annual monitoring, the project is subjected to third party verification every 5 years. The last verification was conducted on the project in 2013, covering all issuances to the project up to December 2012. The project is therefore due for another set of monitoring in late 2018, for all issuances covering the period 2013 to 2017.

10.2 Farmer Capacity

The project will continue training farmers in the project operations as well as in the establishment and management of enterprises supported by the trees. The main focus of the capacity building will continue to be on empowering farmer leaders to build the capacity of fellow farmers. The farmer leaders will also be facilitated to implement the new skills.

10.3 Support to the New Technical Specifications

The project will continue supporting some of the old farmers where the initial technical specifications failed, to migrate to the new technical specifications. The emphasis will be on Hoima, Masindi & Mitooma Districts. Kasese and Rubirizi are working well and the Mt. Elgon farmers have always applied the new technical specifications

11. APPENDICES

Appendix I: List of buyers since project inception

Year of Sale	Buyer	tCO_2 purchased	Total cost (USD)
2003	Tpk2003	11,200	
2005	Tpk2004	9,222	
2005	INASP1	102	
2005	One World	4	
2005	Future Forest	10,000	
2006	Tpk2005	10,933	
2006	INASP2	133	
2006	U&W1	22	
2006	U&W2	2,550	
2006	Nicola Webb	20	
2006	Save Children	3	
2006	In-2 technology	21	
2006	Hambleside Danelow	1,217	
2007	Tpk2006	5,000	
2007	In-2 technology	22	
2007	Robert Harley	10	
2007	U&W	265	
2007	U&W	2,744	
2007	U&W	5,625	
2008	Camco	40,000	
2008	U&W	2,786	
2008	U&W	2,062	
2008	U&W	1,155	
2008	U&W	11,266	
2008	U&W	1,001	
2008	Tpk2007	21,000	
2008	Live Climate	250	
2008	It's the Planet	600	
2008	In-2 technology	23	
2008	Pam friend	17	
2008	Sandra Hughes	54	
2008	Steffie Broer	40	
2008	Gloria Kirabo	1	
2008	INASP	168	
2008	Tapani Vainio	5	
2009	Tetra Pak	5,000	
2009	U&W	20,590	
2009	U&W	2,022	
2009	Emil Ceramica	125	
2009	Ceramica Sant Agostino SpA	424	
2009	In2 Technology	23	
2009	Classic Africa Safaris	167	
2009	City of London	220	
2009	Blue Green Carbon	29	
2009	Tetra Pak	10,100	
2010	U&W	28,538	
2010	U&W	3,111	
2010	Ceramica Sant'Agostino S.p.A	1,615	

2010	Tetra Pak	15,100	
2010	Uganda Carbon Bureau	199	
2010	Straight Plc	1,000	
2010	IIED	779	
2010	Danish Embassy Kampala	414	
2010	International Lifeline Fund (UCB)	123	
2010	Nedbank	30,000	
2010	Wilton Park	17	
2011	U&W NCC & other	11,000	
2011	Ceramica Sant'Agostino S.p.A	3,150	
2011	Max Hamburger	55,000	
2011	KALIP	160	
2011	SPGS	77	
2011	G&C Tours	253	
2011	UBoC	2,507	
2011	International Lifeline Fund (UCB)	96	
2011	Nkuringo Gorilla Camp	55	
2011	Myclimate	10,000	
2012	Max Hamburger	60,498	
2012	Max Hamburger	78,892	
2012	Straight Plc	1,100	
2012	Bartlett Foundation	412	
2012	U&W	3,400	
2012	Ceramica Sant'Agostino S.p.A	2,120	
2012	Emil Ceramica	100	
2012	Ecometrica	110	
2012	Classic Africa Safaris	129	
2012	The Embassy of Ireland in Uganda	211	
2012	N. Uganda Agricultural Livelihoods Recovery Prog. & Karamoja Livelihoods Prog.	62	
2012	Mihingo Lodge	45	
2012	Kampala Aero Club & Flight Training Center	1,332	
2013	Granite Fiandre Spa	4,600	
2013	KALIP	107	
2013	Royal Danish Embassy	196	
2013	Classic Africa Safaris	81	
2013	Kampala Aero Club	1,680	
2013	Arla	21,308	
2013	Ima	114	
2013	Ima	13	
2013	climate path	70	
2013	Max stock	5,610	
2013	COTAP-1	287	
2013	COTAP-2	309	
2013	COTAP-3	208	
2013	Source Sustainable	15	
2014	Max	90,000	
2014	Arla Foods	2,975	
2014	Arla Foods	14,168	
2014	U&We Arla & Other	13,480	
2014	U&We Other	400	
2014	U&We Other	14,168	
2014	U&We Arla	37,000	
2014	ZeroMission	1,488	
2014	Arvid Nordquist	5,000	
2014	Royal Danish Embassy	192	

2014	Nkuringo Gorilla Camp	38	
2014	Embassy of Ireland	226	
2014	Karamoja Livelihoods Program (KALIP)	145	
2014	Embassy of Ireland	178	
2014	COTAP-4	414	
2015	COTAP-5	309	
2015	COTAP-6	364	
2015	COTAP-7	254	
2015	U&We Arla Q1	34,500	
2015	U&We Arla Q2 & others	31,000	
2015	U&We Arla Q3	27,885	
2015	U&We Arla Q4	36,500	
2015	U&We Max	96,000	
2015	Max	30,000	
2015	Others	982	
2015	Mihingo Lodge	48	
2016	U&We Arla Q1	16,500	
2016	U&We Arla Q2 & others	3,200	
2016	U&We Arla Q3	3,249	
2016	Uganda Carbon Bureau	215	
2016	COTAP	589	
2016	MyClmate	2,665	
2016	MyClmate	3,033	
	Total	**991,589**	

UNSOLD STOCK UP TO AND INCLUDING 2017 VINTAGE CREDITS

Vint.2014	Unsold stock	69	
Vint.2016	Unsold stock	96,570	
Vint.2017 (current request)	Unsold stock	7,909	
	Total unsold stock including 2017 issuance	**104,548**	

SALES RELATED TO 2017 ANNUAL REPORT

Vintage 2016	Zero Mission	3,400	
Vintage 2016	Zero Mission	3,283	
Vintage 2014	COTAP	292	
Vintage 2010	COTAP	1,169	
Vintage 2017	Zero Mission (Max)	57,092	
Vintage 2017	Zero Mission (Max)	50,121	
Vintage 2017	Zero Mission	2200	
Vintage 2017	Zero Mission (Antalis, etc)	768	
Vintage 2017	Zero Mission	1,520	
Vintage 2017	Uganda Carbon Bureau (Classic Africa)	52	
	Total	**119,897**	

Total PVCs after 2017 issuance	**1,216,034**

Total historical revenue received by ECOTRUST	**$ 6,379,034.15**

Appendix II: List of Village Savings & Loans Associations Supported by TGB

1. **Mubuku Intergrated Farmers Association(MIFA)**
2. **Ruboni Development SACCO Limited**
3. **Ruboni Community Conservation**
4. **Kilembe Inter Community Based Organisation**
5. **Kilembe United Farmers SACCO**
6. **Ikongo SACCO**
7. **Hima SACCO**
8. **Rutookye Peoples Saving and Credit Society**
9. **Kyamuhunga Peoples Saving and Credit Society Ltd**
10. **Bunyaruguru Development SACCO**
11. **Bitereko Peoples SACCO**
12. **Kiyanga SACCO**
13. **Rukoma Financial Services Cooperative**
14. **Katerera Twetungure SACCO**
15. **Elgon Farmers SACCO**
16. **Mbale Epicenter SACCO Ltd**
17. **Manafwa Teachers SACCO**
18. **Kyangwali SIDA SACCO**
19. **Bosoba SACCO**
20. **Ndangara/Nyakiyanja T Group**
21. **Busoga SACCO**

Appendix III: List of seedling suppliers supported by TGB

1	Aganyira James
2	Agaba Annet
3	Bwambale Samuel
4	Nyamutale Charles
5	Namwirya Winfred
6	Beneco LTD
7	Abitegeka Wilfred
8	Andama Moses (Across International (U) LTD)
9	Aheebwa Mark
10	Kaahwa Yafesi
11	Kato Christopher
12	Oleru Hellen
13	Isingoma Dauda
14	Kabahuma Margaret
15	Bwambale Samson
16	Kiiza Augustine Kireru
17	Wamboza Andrew (Green Uganda nursery Services)
18	Kabuhuma Margaret
19	Mbabazi Twesigye Thadeo
20	Bwambale Samwiri
21	Nyajura Sarah
22	Tugumenawe Nelson

Appendix IV: List of Community – Based Organisations formed / supported by Trees for Global Benefit

a) Collaborative Forest Management Groups Participating in TGB or Whose Capacity to Monitor Threats to Forestry has been built

Buzenga Environmental Conservation Association (BUECA) Ndangaro Environmental Conservation Association (NECA) Butoha Tusherure Ebyabuzire Association (BUTEA)
Mwogyera Parish Environmental Conservation Association (MPECA) Katanda Tree Growers Association (KATGA)
Rwazere Tree Growers Association (RTGA) Kanywambogo Development Association Bitooma Abeteritine Twabeisheho Association
Nyarugote CFM
swazi nitubasa CFM
Mubuku Integrated Farmer's Association (CFM)
Ndangara Nyakiyanja Tutungukye group (CFM)
Rwoburunga Bahigi Tulinde Obwobuhangwa
Kapeeka Integrated Community Devt Association (KICODA)
Siiba Environmental Conservation and Development Association
Nyakase Environmental Conservation and Development Association (NECODA)
Karujubu Forest Adjacent Communities Association (KAFACA)
Budongo Good Neighbours Conservation Association (BUNCA)
North Budongo Forest Communities Association (NOBUFOCA)
Kidoma Conservation and Development Association (KICODA)
Kaseeta Tugende Omumaiso Association
Kabwoya Environmental Conservation Development Association (KEDA)
Kyangwali Twimukye Association

b) Communal Land Associations Established with Support from ECOTRUST

No.	Name of Community Forest	Area under management (Ha)	Name of Communal Land Association (CLA)
1	Ongo	193	Ongo Communal Land Association
2	Alimugonza	35	Alimugonza Communal Land Association

c) RESOURCE USER GROUPS, whose agreements were facilitated and/or supported by ECOTRUST

Bunaiga Resource User Group
Kisamba 11 Resource User Group
Mbunga Resource User Group
Bunyandiko Resource User Group
Katunguru Women resource user Group
Kayanja Resource User Group
Katwe Tourism Integrated Community (KATIC)
Kikorongo womens group

d) TGB Farmer CBOs (which are not in CFM)

Kasese

Ruboni Community Conservation Group
Kilembe intercommunity organisation
kigoro carbon farmers group
kabaka water user group
Buhuhira ex hunters group
Kinyabwamba carbon farmers

Mitooma/Rrubirizi Districts

Katanda carbon farmers group
Bitereko Carbon Farmers Group
Kiyanga Environmental Conservation Association

Masindi District

Karujubu Fruit growers and environmental conservation association (KAFECA).

Bududa District

Nakatsi Carbon Farmers' Group
Bukibokolo Carbon Farmers Saving Group
Bwahata carbon farmers saving group

Mbale District

- Bubetye Carbon Farmers Association (registered at district)
- Nabumali Tree Planting Group
- Nyondo Farmers development Group
- Bufukhula Beekeeping farmers group

Manafwa District

- See light Ahead Association (registered at district)
- Bubetye Integrated Farmers Group (registered at district)
- Khaukha Carbon farmers' group
- Bushuiu carbon farmer's group

e) Parish Adaptation Groups in Bulambuli & Sironko

	District	Sub-County	Parish Adaptation Committee	Catchment
1	Bulambuli	Lusha (upstream)	Kinganda	River Sissiyi
2			Bumwambu	
3			Jewa	
4		Bulegeni (downstream)	Muvule	
5			Mbigi	
6			Samazi	
7	Sironko	Bugitimwa (upstream)	Elgon	River Sironko
8			Kisali	
9			Bugitimwa	
10		Budadiri (downstream)	Kalawa Cell	
11			Nakiwondwe	
12			Bunyodde	