Trees for Global Benefits

2018 Plan Vivo Annual Report

Submitted: 15th May 2019

Approved: 25th June 2019

Organisation:	The Environmental Conservation Trust of Uganda (ECOTRUST)
Contact Person:	Pauline Nantongo Kalunda- Executive Director
Address:	Lubowa Housing Estate, Entebbe Road, Kampala P. O. Box 8986, Kampala, Uganda
Telephone/fax:	+256-31-2266419
Mob:	0772743562
Email:	pnantongo@ECOTRUST.or.ug
Website:	www.ECOTRUST.or.ug

1. Summary

Project overview	
Reporting period	**January to December 2018**
Geographical areas	**Albertine Rift** (Rubirizi, Mitooma, Kasese, Hoima, Masindi Districts) **Mt. Elgon** (Mbale, Manafwa, Bududa, Bulambuli, Sironko, Namisindwa Districts)
Technical specifications in use	***Maesopsis Eminii*** – Original technical specification (applied until 2014) ***Mixed Native Sp.*** – Approved 1st April 2016. This technical specification comprises three different systems: [1] - Boundary Planting (carbon potential 65.24 tCO_2/ha equivalent to 163.1 tCO_2/Km) - Dispersed Interplanting (carbon potential 170.40 tCO_2/ha) - Woodlots (carbon potential 238.80 tCO_2/ha)

Project indicators	Historical (2003-2017)	Added/ Issued this period (2018)	Total
Number of smallholder households with PES agreements	6104	892	6996
Number of community groups with PES agreements (where applicable) by Dec 2018	83	0	83
Approximate number of households (or individuals) in these community groups	375	60	435
Number of employees, hired by the project- Full-time	22	0	22
Number of employees, hired by the project- Part-time	69	0	69
Number of Village Savings & Loans Associations supported by TGB	21	0	21
Number of commercial nurseries supported by TGB	22	0	22
Area under management (ha) where PES agreements are in place (includes boundary planting)	5967.21	544.98	6512.19
Total PES payments made to participants (USD)	$2,458,281.82	$278,831	$2,737,112.82
Average smallholder household income as a result of PVC sales (USD)	n/a	n/a	$668.91
Total sum held in trust for future PES payments (USD)	$1,533,426	$409,143	$1,942,569
Saleable emissions reductions achieved this period (tCO_2)		128,368	
Adjustments corresponding to previous years (tCO_2)		-18,351	
Total saleable emissions reductions (tCO_2)	1,216,034	111,852	1,327,886
Allocation to Plan Vivo buffer account (tCO_2)	135,115	12,428	147,543
Unsold Stock at time of submission (PVC)			
Vintage 2014	69	-51	18
Vintage 2016	96,570	-72,275	24,295
Vintage 2017	7,909	-2,384	5,525
Vintage 2018 (current request)		21,004	19,714
Total Unsold Stock (PVC)			49,552
Plan Vivo Certificates (PVCs) issued to date			**1,216,034**
Plan Vivo Certificates requested for issuance (2018 Vintage)			**111,852**
Total PVCs issued (including this report)			**1,327,886**

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

Table of Contents

Tim Whitley of COTAP visiting one of the Farmers growing Trees for Global Benefit in Kasese District. *Photo Courtesy of ECOTRUST*

2. Key Events, Developments and Challenges

Trees for Global Benefits (TGB) 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 (TGB) won the 2013 UN SEED Award for being an exceptional social and environmental low carbon enterprise. The award recognizes 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 2018.

2.1. Key Events

2.1.1. Third-Party Verification

In addition to the annual monitoring, the project underwent third party verification, conducted by Environmental Services Inc during the reporting year. The purpose of verification, which takes place every five years, is to document the conformance of The Trees for Global Benefits Project with the requirements of the Plan Vivo Standard and ensure that the ecosystem service benefits have materialized in line with expectations.

The last verification was conducted in 2013, covering all issuances to the project up to December 2012. The project was again verified in November 2018 and, although the project was focusing on all issuances covering the period 2013 to 2017, the audit scope covered the entire duration of the project since inception. A final report has been submitted by the third-party verifiers and the project has been found to continue to comply with the requirements of the Plan Vivo Standard.

2.1.2. Global Landscape Forum

ECOTRUST shared knowledge and experiences at the Learning Pavilion during the 2018 Global Landscapes Forum (GLF) held in Bonn, German. During the GLF, TGB showcased lessons that have been generated in the past 15 years as a smallholder farmer-led landscape restoration programme, centred around an ecosystem-based adaptation approach. In addition to sharing knowledge and experiences, ECOTRUST also shared tools on how land restoration can increase the adaptive capacity, and enhance the resilience, of ecosystems.

2.1.3. Community Visioning

The TGB communities in Mitooma, Masindi, Kasese and Hoima districts were encouraged to enhance community development and environmental management visions through visioning exercises. The community visions are one of the tools that ECOTRUST uses to raise the visibility of the communities that are participating in TGB. They are also one of many tools used to engage with the local governments as part of their participation in the district level planning processes. The visioning exercises were supported by the Shared Resources, Joint Solutions (SRJS) programme. SRJS is an evidence-based lobby and advocacy programme that mobilizes Private Sector, CSO and government to invest in sustainable practices for the provision of International Public Goods (IPGs) of Food Security, Water Provisioning & Climate Resilience. In Uganda the SRJS programme is implemented by ECOTRUST in partnership with NAPE, AFIEGO, IUCN-UCO and IUCN-NL.

2.1.4. Capacity-Building for Host Communities on Impacts of the Tilenga Oil & Gas Project[1]

In collaboration with the National Association of Environmental Specialists (NAPE) ECOTRUST organized a capacity building event for community representatives of Buliisa, Masindi and Hoima districts. The events concerned the process and the potential impact of the on-going Tilenga project activities. Meeting were undertaken that aimed to enable the Project Affected Persons (PAPs) to effectively participate in the upcoming public hearing meeting on Environmental and Social Impact Assessment of the project (ESIA). By applying this approach, NAPE and ECOTRUST believe that these communities will be empowered to ask pertinent questions on livelihood issues during the public hearing, be aware of the opportunity costs to their livelihoods, and be better informed about the ESIA and how to deal with the related impacts. It is also expected that, by understanding the oil development trajectory, the communities are better able to plan their forestry activities.

A total number of 34 people participated in this meeting. Among these were women and men whose farm land would directly be affected, indigenous clans who are custodians of the natural heritage (i.e. ecosystems), and the local leaders of these three districts.

[1] Tilenga Project involves the drilling and transportation of oil from Murchison Falls area, crossing the River Nile and draining in the Central Processing Facility in Hoima District, near Lake Albert.

Capacity building for Farmers to participate in the consultations for Oil & Gas development.
Photo Courtesy of ECOTRUST

2.1.5. Annual Stakeholders' Meeting

ECOTRUST held its annual stakeholders' event in November 2018 in Kampala at the Golf Course Hotel. The theme of the event was: **Celebrating 15 years of Trees for Global Benefit - Making Landscapes, Businesses and People Climate Resilient.** This is an annual event that brings together ECOTRUST stakeholders and focuses on discussing the progress made in the implementation of the strategic plan. Key stakeholders at the event included farmer leaders, nursery operators, donors, government parastatals, CSOs, and representatives from the private sector. The weeklong event involved Focus Group Discussions/feedback consultations with farmer representatives, community-based nursery operators, CSOs, government parastatals, and the donor community. The event culminated with a general public event that brought together all stakeholders as ECOTRUST showcased various innovations that have been designed to achieve its goal '*to provide sustained funding for conservation*'.

TGB in particular was show-cased as an example of an approach through which foreign direct investments for smallholder-led agroforestry can be mobilized in the form of the sale of environmental services. This was done through exhibitions using interactive story maps and virtual tours, as well as plenary workshops and plenary expert presentations on topics including: Financial inclusion, biodiversity and eco-system conservation mechanisms, community-forest tenure, & management to understanding the dynamics of achieving a consistent and efficient agro-forestry carbon project.

The event also involved presentation of a dummy cheque, representing payments made to the different farming communities in 2017, in addition to certificates in recognition of the 33 pioneer farmers.

Some of the TGB farmers celebrating their carbon payments with a dummy cheque at the 2018 Annual Stakeholders engagement event. *Photo Courtesy of ECOTRUST*

2.2. Key Developments

2.2.1. Assessment of Areas of Expansion

Feasibility assessments were conducted with the aim of establishing the feasibility of extending Trees for Global Benefits to the Districts of Kamwenge, Kiryandongo, Isingiro, Ntoroko, Bundibugyo and Kabale. The assessment included meetings with local government officials (environment, forestry, and community development offices) as well as the farmers. The assessments followed expressions of interest by farmers from the above-named districts in the form of requests to be considered to participate in the TGB project. This was due to, from their opinion, the project's ability to contribute to both livelihood improvement and environmental conservation. The feasibility assessment confirmed that, with the exception of Ntoroko, TGB can be extended to the new districts without having to develop new technical specifications. Ntoroko is a semi-arid district that lies within the cattle corridor and thus require tree planting systems that are different from those described in any of the existing technical specifications (the current technical specifications are meant for the banana-coffee agro-ecological zone of Uganda).

2.2.2. Communal Land Associations

The project is focusing on the conservation of riverine corridor forests to maintain ecological connectivity between the different protected areas within the Budongo Systems Range. It aims to achieve this through the creation of Communal Land Associations (CLAs). Three CLAs were surveyed in 2018 and now await their official declaration as Community Forests by the Minister of Water and Environment.

2.2.3. Wetland Conservation Agreements

With support from the GIZ IWASP programme[1], ECOTRUST has introduced the concept of Conservation Agreements within the project operational areas as a mechanism for linking communities to incentives, and therefore reward tangible wetland conservation impacts. ECOTRUST is currently working with two Wetland Associations/communities in the Masindi District as part of a programme to address threats to Kiiha catchment wetlands, which are part of the Kafu River Sub-catchment in the Albertine region. The overall goal of the IWASP project is to improve water security for water users in the Kiiha Watershed by tackling shared water risks. This is one of the catchments of focus within the TGB operational areas, as it provides water and environmental resources for sustaining livelihoods, agriculture, commerce, and ecosystem services. Through this project, ECOTRUST is engaging with the communities in wetland conservation via the Wetland Associations. Conservation activities under this engagement include: Wetland buffer-line establishment, regular monitoring of the naturally regenerating (formerly degraded) sections, tree planting, and protection of various forms of fauna and flora therein.

2.2.4. Staff Capacity Building

ECOTRUST staff have continued to participate in a number of trainings including outcome harvesting (OH) and integration of Ecosystem services into development planning (based on The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB)). This capacity-building method was made possible by the Shared Resources, Joint Solutions Programme (SRJSP), which is supported by the Dutch Government through the Netherlands' Committee of IUCN.

Staff Capacity Building on The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB)

[1] IWaSP is the International Water Security Programme, which combines global best practices in water stewardship with local knowledge. The programme facilitates partnerships between the public sector, the private sector and civil society to address shared water risks whilst improving stakeholders' use and management of water and building their capacity to develop their own solutions.

2.3. Key challenges

2.3.1. Monitoring Scattered Small Holdings

The growing number of smallholders and scattered landholdings, especially in Kasese and Mbale districts, still represented a major challenge in 2018. These two districts have steep terrain due to Rwenzori and Mt. Elgon for Kasese and Mbale respectively. This combination of scattered small holdings and steep terrain increases the cost of monitoring and recruitment.

To overcome this issue, ECOTRUST has identified and contracted community-based monitors (individuals who live in the project sites, and not necessarily farmers) to offer short-term technical assistance during monitoring. In addition, ECOTRUST has embarked on the development of a monitoring application to speed up information processing during farmer recruitment and monitoring. Although not yet completed, this development is expected to lower monitoring costs by minimising the time devoted to these processes.

2.3.2. Pests & Diseases

The challenge of pests and diseases has persisted for farmers in Rubirizi, Mitooma, Hoima and Masindi, which has caused dieback of some Maesopsis at approximately year 5 of development. These instances of dieback have discouraged some farmers from growing indigenous trees and instead persuaded them to replace the lost Maesopsis with eucalyptus. In addition to this, in Kasese, some farmers have been facing challenges from termites damaging grevillea crops.

To help minimize the risk of damage from pests and diseases, the project has been engaging with affected farmers and advising them to maintain their gardens/woodlots through spot weeding, proper pruning and thinning (removal of the diseased trees). Such practices will increase the ability of the tree stands to overcome pests and diseases. In instances where damage has already occurred, the farmers have been supported to replace the lost trees with different species (those recommended in the mixed native woodlot technical specifications).

2.2.3. Drought and Other Environmental Challenges

Some project areas have continued to experience a number of environmental challenges. Events such as these have influenced tree performance, particularly the in the districts of Hoima and Masindi. In these areas, instances of prolonged droughts and/or periods of heavy rain have resulted in significant damage to the farmers' trees. The project has therefore assisted these farmers through the provision of free seedlings to enable them to replant and meet the required targets. A summary of this distribution of seedlings is provided in Table 1.

Table 1: Summary of farmers who have been supported with free seedlings

District	Total distributed	Number of farmers who received seedlings
Hoima	81,000	81
Masindi	16,046	161

2.2.4. Land Tenure and Oil & Gas Developments

Many land transfer cases have been registered in Hoima district, with a number of TGB farmers selling land and moving to other areas. Although these sites have not been affected by the Oil & Gas developments, the displacements of the affected communities have induced a feeling of uncertainty among neighbouring communities. The majority of the new landowners have expressed intent to continue with the project and have consequently been trained on the project requirements.

Land conflicts, as a result of the oil & gas developments, are on the rise. This is discouraging some people from planting trees. To help mitigate this issue, and provide greater land-tenure assurances for those who are considering to planting trees, ECOTRUST is currently exploring opportunities for supporting these smallholder TGB farmers to register land under customary ownership.

3. *Activities, total project size and participation*

3.1. Current Technical Specifications

The project has continued to use the *Maesopsis eminii* technical specification in addition to the Mixed Native Spp. technical specification, in boundary, woodlot and intercropping systems. However, all new farmers are being recruited onto the Mixed Native Spp technical specification in woodlot, dispersed interplanting and boundary planting systems**.** Where the *Maesopsis eminii* technical specification has not been successful, farmers are being supported to adopt the new technical specifications without necessarily changing the contract terms. All gap filling by the continuing farmers is being guided by the Mixed Native Technical Specifications.

During the reporting period, the project gave approval to a total of 982 farmers to plant, which had the potential to bring 648.4 ha of farmland under improved management 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*. Table 2 below provides a summary of farmers who were given the go ahead to plant.

Table 2: Total number of farmers given go ahead to plant (including those that did not qualify)

District	Number of farmers	Ha to be planted	Target number of trees to be planted	Number of trees monitored	Total tCO_2	Saleable tCO_2
Mixed Native Woodlot						
Hoima	60	50.5	20600	10110	12059.4	10853.5
Kasese	513	385.7	153660	82519	92093.2	82883.9
Masindi	49	38.3	15320	5125	9153.2	8237.9
Rubirizi	88	86.9	34960	26354	20751.7	18676.5
Mt. Elgon	19	3.4	1308	1305	800.0	720.0
TOTAL	**729**	**564.7**	**225847.6**	**125413**	**134857.5**	**121371.8**
Dispersed Interplanting						
Mt Elgon	239	71.9	22310	15497	12246.6	11022.0
Total	**239**	**71.9**	**22309.7**	**15497**	**12246.6**	**11022.0**
Boundary Planting						
Mt Elgon	14	11.8	852	840	770.9	693.8
Total	**14**	**11.8**	**852**	**840**	**770.9**	**693.8**
GRAND TOTAL	**982**	**648.4**	**249009**	**141750**	**147875.1**	**133087.6**

4. Submission for Plan Vivo Certificate Issuance

During the reporting period, a total of **944** farmers qualified and were recruited into the programme (compared to 795 recruited in 2017), which represents 96% of the 982 farmers who were given a go-ahead to plant. This brought **625.0 ha** of farmland under improved management (compared to 646.31 in 2017), using the Mixed Native Spp technical specification.

Although the number of new farmers continues to increase, the number of hectares brought under improved management in this reporting period has reduced. The majority of the farmers have continued to come from Kasese District (511 farmers), which accounts for 54% of the recruited farmers. The number of qualified farmers recruited from Mt. Elgon has increased significantly from just 28 farmers in 2017 to 255 farmers in 2018.

Table 3a provides the breakdown of qualified farmers 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.

The overall net increase in participants and land under improved management is 892 and 545.0 ha respectively. These values take into consideration adjustments made due to the movement of previously-qualified farmers in/out of the programme (details of which is provided in Section 6).

Table 3a: Summary recruitment (qualified farmers) per technical specification per district

Sub-county	Number of farmers	Ha to be planted	Target number of trees to be planted	Number of trees monitored	Total tCO_2	Saleable tCO_2
Mixed Native Woodlot						
Hoima						
Busereka	6	5.5	2180	967	1301.5	1171.3
Kabwoya	11	10.0	4000	2469	2388.0	2149.2
Kigorobya	4	4.0	1600	92	955.2	859.7
Kiziranfumbi	28	22.8	9720	5510	5444.6	4900.2
Kyangwali	8	5.5	2000	982	1313.4	1182.1
Total Hoima	57	47.8	19500	10020	11402.7	10262.4
Kasese						
Bugoye	164	125.5	50200	26483	29969.4	26972.5
Kilembe	3	1.5	0	487	358.2	322.4
Kisinga	24	12.5	5000	2249	2985.0	2686.5
Kyarumba	79	52.3	20900	11297	12477.3	11229.6
Kyondo	1	0.5	200	126	119.4	107.5
Maliba	140	124.4	49760	26186	29706.7	26736.0
Nyamwamba	11	6.5	2600	1401	1552.2	1397.0
Rukoki	89	61.5	24600	14238	14686.2	13217.6
Total Kasese	511	384.7	153260	82467	91854.4	82669.0

			Masindi			
Budongo	9	6.1	2440	1360	1463.8	1317.5
Bwijanga	10	8.4	3360	1921	2005.9	1805.3
Karujubu	2	1.0	400	144	238.8	214.9
Nyangahya	8	5.7	2280	1216	1361.2	1225.0
Pakanyi	4	2.5	1000	285	597.0	537.3
Total Masindi	33	23.7	9480	4926	5666.7	5100.1
			Rubirizi			
Katanda	18	19.5	7800	5292	4656.6	4190.9
Katerera	14	13.5	5400	3141	3223.8	2901.4
Kyabakara	18	18.0	7200	5126	4298.4	3868.6
Kichwamba	10	8.9	3560	2293	2125.3	1912.8
Ryeru	28	27.0	11000	10502	6447.6	5802.8
Total Rubirizi	88	86.9	34960	26354	20751.7	18676.5
			Mt. Elgon			
Sironko	1	0.1	40	25	23.9	21.5
Mbale	2	0.2	56	81	52.5	47.3
Manafwa	14	2.9	1160	1136	692.5	623.3
Bulambuli	2	0.1	52	63	31.0	27.9
Total Mt. Elgon	**19**	**3.4**	**1308**	**1305**	**800.0**	**720.0**
Mixed Native Woodlot Total	**708**	**546.4**	**218507.6**	**125072**	**130475.5**	**117428.0**
			Mixed Native Dispersed planting			
Bududa	20	5.6	1745	1535	959.4	863.4
Bulambuli	24	4.5	1398	971	768.5	691.7
Manafwa	26	7.1	2198	1761	1208.1	1087.3
Mbale	110	35.7	11088	7757	6078.2	5470.4
Namisindwa	9	4.5	1401	903	770.2	693.2
Sironko	33	9.4	2911	2290	1600.1	1440.1
Mixed Native Dispersed Total	**222**	**66.8**	**20741**	**15217**	**11384.4**	**10246.0**
			Mixed Native Boundary Planting			
Bududa	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0.0
Bulambuli	2	0.4	30	38	24.8	22.3
Manafwa	3	3.5	185	169	227.1	204.4
Mbale	3	0.5	38	67	31.3	28.2
Namisindwa	3	5.6	450	339	366.7	330.0
Sironko	3	1.9	148	227	121.0	108.9
Mixed Native Boundary Planting Total	**14**	**11.8**	**852**	**840**	**770.9**	**693.8**
GRAND TOTAL ALL	**944**	**625.0**	**240100**	**141129**	**142630.9**	**128367.8**

Table 3b: Summary of issuance per technical specification

Technical specification	Number of farmers	Ha to be planted	Target number of trees to be planted	Number of trees monitored	Total tCO_2	Saleable tCO_2
Mixed Native Spp Woodlot	708	546.4	218508	125072	130475.5	117428.0
Mixed Native Spp Dispersed Interplanting	222	66.8	20741	15217	11384.4	10246.0
Mixed Native Spp Boundary planting	14	11.8	852	840	770.9	693.8
Total	**944**	**625.0**	**240100**	**141129**	**142630.9**	**128367.8**

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

Qualified total tCO2	142,631
Allocated to replacements*	-11,480
Prior year adjustments**	-6,870
Buffer allocation (10%)	-12,428
Saleable tCO2 available for issuance (90%)	**111,852**

*Replacements regard the net change in carbon from farmers who have left the programme and farmers who had previous left the programme but have since rejoined and resumed management.

**Adjustments regard the net change in carbon from farmers who joined in previous years but have since reduced their planting targets.

Total PVCs after 2018 issuance	**1,327,886**

5. *Sales of Plan Vivo Certificates*

During the annual reporting period (2018), the project has sold 166,848 tCO_2 (up from 119,897tCO_2 tCO_2 in 2017) to various buyers, as indicated in Table 4a below. This includes 92,138 tCO_2 from new issuances (vintage 2018), and 74,710 tCO_2 from existing vintages of stock.

Table 4a: Sales for the reporting period January to December 2018

Vintage	Name of purchaser/source of funds	Number of PVCs purchased	Price per certificate (USD)	Total amount received (USD)
2018	ZeroMission Max	79,503		
2018	ZeroMission	9,135		
2018	ZeroMission	3,500		
Subtotal		**92,138**		
2014	Uganda Carbon Bureau	51		
2016	Myclimate	10,000		
2016	ZeroMission Max	62,275		
2017	COTAP	2,177		
2017	Uganda Carbon Bureau	207		
Subtotal		**74,710**		
Total sales in 2018		**166,848**		

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

Total sales of Plan Vivo Certificates stands at 1,278,334 tCO_2 broken down as follows:

Table 4b: Total number of certificates sold since project inception

Year	tCO_2	Average price/tCO_2 (USD)	Total price (USD)
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	694467.40
2018	**166,848**	**5.92**	**988,056**
Total	**1,278,334**	**$ 5.74**	**$ 7,349,561.44**

For a full sales record, with respective volumes, see Appendix I. Below is the list of *unsold stock* for vintages 2014 to 2018 at 31 December 2018.

Table 4c: Number of Certificates available for sale.

Vintage	Number of PVCs
2014	18
2016	24,295
2017	5,525
2018 (current request)	19,714
Total Unsold Stock (PVC)	**49,552**

6. *Summary of Monitoring Results*

6.1. Introduction

ECOTRUST has maintained monitoring of continuing farmers to establish their progress towards their improved land use targets, as per their contracts in accordance with their respective technical specifications. The monitoring teams comprise of farmer coordinators, farmers (trained as local technicians) as well as experts (as both full time & part time staff). The monitoring exercise has been conducted through home visits to individual farmers, in which the species, number of trees planted, and hectares of land under improved management are recorded. Any trees on farms that were established five or more years ago also have their diameter, crown width and height measured.

During the reporting period, the project was able to visit 2,948 (94.6%) out of the 3,116 farmers that were due for monitoring. The highest coverage, both in terms of the total number of farmers visited and percentage coverage, was in Kasese, followed by Rubirizi and Mitooma. Home visits were attempted for the 166 (5.1%) farmers that were not monitored, however, for varying reasons, there was no one at home to guide the monitoring team. The famers that were missed, and those that did not meet targets for the year, will be included in the monitoring of 2019 and their payments will be delivered after confirmation that they have met their targets. The number of farmers visited in the various districts is presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Number of farmers monitored in the different districts

District	Number of farmers due for monitoring	Number of farmers monitored	Percentage monitored
Bulambuli	154	76	49%
Kasese	1267	1267	100%
Manafwa	30	24	80%
Masindi	362	350	97%
Mbale	27	20	74%
Mitooma	409	409	100%
Rubirizi	489	489	100%
Sironko	145	80	55%
Hoima	233	233	100%
Total	**3,116**	**2,948**	**94.6%**

6.2. General Performance

Of the monitored farmers, 1976 (67%) met their targets, whilst 972 (33%) farmers did not meet their targets. This is an improvement in the number of farmers meeting their targets, up from last year's performance of 65%. Some of the farmers that did not meet their targets possessed the required trees, but the trees had not been planted in accordance with the technical specifications, often due to poor spacing. These were primarily farmers in year 1 and year 3 of development.

The farmers in Year 5 and above that did not meet target are mainly those farmers that are being supported to transition to the new technical specifications. This is because, although existing trees on most of the farms had attained the expected DBH, they did not qualify for payment due to failure to meet the expected number of trees. There were also incidences of pests affecting the *maesopsis* (see Section 2.3.2.), and occasional flooding

and/or drought (see Section 2.3.3.). The general performance for the farmers, with respect to their development year, is presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Number of farmers according to year of monitoring

Year	Number of farmers that met targets	Number of farmers that did not meet targets
Year 1	782	381
Year 3	680	366
Year 5	460	200
Year 7	4	4
Year 10	50	21
Total	**1,976**	**972**

6.3. Individual district performances

Table 7 provides a summary of overall performance according to district.

Table 7: Individual district performances

District	Number of farmers that met target	Number of farmers that did not meet target	Percentage of farmers that met target
Bulambuli	72	4	94.7%
Kasese	782	485	61.7%
Manafwa	14	10	58.3%
Masindi	197	153	56.3%
Mbale	17	3	85.0%
Mitooma	240	169	58.7%
Rubirizi	439	50	89.8%
Sironko	72	8	90.0%
Hoima	143	90	61.4%
Total	**1,976**	**972**	**67.02%**

6.3.1. Kasese

Kasese had the largest number of farmers due for monitoring (1266) and they were all successfully monitored, with 61.7% (781) achieving their respective targets. Generally, the performance in Kasese is promising and a significant proportion of the farmers had very good and healthy trees. The biggest challenge faced in this region is with the year 3 farmers, as most have not adhered to the spacing that is recommended in the technical specifications. This non-compliance accounts for the 267 year 3 farmers that did not qualify. These farmers have been advised to plant more trees on other parts of their farms. However, it is important to note that, although the farmers in Kasese generally achieve their targets, they continue to experience risks of damage to their trees from termites, droughts, and floods from River Nyamwamba. Table 8 provides an overview of performance in Kasese District, separated by stage in the project.

Table 8: Performance of Kasese farmers by year of planting

Year	Number of farmers that met targets	Number of farmers that did not meet targets
Year 1	394	140
Year 3	261	267
Year 5	123	75
Year 7	3	3
Total	**781**	**485**

6.3.2. Rubirizi/Mitooma

A total of 905 farmers were monitored in Rubirizi and Mitooma, which is TGB's oldest project site. These monitoring visits comprised of 497 farmers visited in the Rubirizi district and 408 in the Mitooma district. 89.9% (447) of the total number of farmers visited in Rubirizi met their targets, making it the best performing district for the year. This is primarily because there is effective collaboration amongst the farmers and between the farmers and their coordinators, which increased the ability of participants to identify and respond to any challenge.

Although performance is still below average, the Mitooma farmers have shown significant improvement from last year's performance, from 48% to 58.6%. The priority for the year 2018, particularly for the Bitereko subcounty, was to help farmers transition into the new technical specifications. However, it was decided that farmers who are relatively advanced in the project (Yr5 and above) should be supported to keep their current trees, instead of changing planting methods to meet the new technical specification. Any discrepancy in the area of land registered under the project, as a result of this, has been addressed in the adjusted issuance.

Table 9 provides an overview of performance in Rubirizi and Mitooma Districts, separated by stage in project.

Table 9: Performance of Rubirizi and Mitooma districts

Year	Rubirizi		Mitooma	
	Number of farmers that met targets	Number of farmers that did not meet target	Number of farmers that met targets	Number of farmers that did not meet target
Year 1	199	18	1	40
Year 3	149	1	35	44
Year 5	97	30	165	65
Year 10	2	1	38	20
Total	**447**	**50**	**239**	**169**

6.3.3. Hoima/Masindi

All the farmers due for monitoring (227) in Hoima were visited by the monitors. 61.7% (140) of these farmers met their targets, which is similar to last year's performance of 58%. Most of the farmers are still interested in the project and have promised to replant to compensate for any lost trees.

Masindi had a total of 362 farmers due for monitoring and 349 (96.4%) were visited. Out of the 349 farmers, 196 (56.2%) met their targets. Most of the farmers that did not meet

their targets were year 1 farmers. In most cases, these farmers had not any lost trees but rather did not plant the necessary number of trees in year 1. This was due to difficulties experienced with the seedlings provided to support the transition to mixed native woodlots. Those farmers that have consistently failed to advance beyond year 1 have been given the option of reducing their targets (*amendment of contracts*), to levels they are able to achieve. This will enable these farmers to access the performance-based payments. Table 10 provides an overview of performance in Masindi & Hoima Districts, separated by stage in project.

Table 10: Performance of farmers in Hoima & Masindi as per year of monitoring

Year	Hoima		Masindi	
	Number of farmers that met targets	Number of farmers that did not meet target	Number of farmers that met targets	Number of farmers that did not meet target
Year 1	73	66	94	103
Year 3	50	15	49	27
Year 5	17	6	53	23
Total	**140**	**87**	**196**	**153**

The project also conducted a visit to the districts of Hoima and Masindi to following up on farmers that may not be due for monitoring but have been consistently failing to move beyond the first milestone. Some of these farmers felt that they had probably set targets that were higher than they could achieve. Such individuals have been supported to revise down their targets and their contracts have been amended to reflect these revisions. This is expected to motivate the farmers to, as a minimum, maintain the existing trees and receive payments that are commensurate with the new targets. A summary of farmers that have reduced their targets, in the districts of Hoima and Masindi, is presented in Table 11.

Table 11: Farmers that have reduced targets

Region	Number of farmers who reduced their target	Hectares to be replaced
Hoima	37	17.85
Masindi	29	11.91
Total	**66**	**29.76**

6.3.4. Mt Elgon Region

Mt Elgon region had a total of 356 farmers due for monitoring and out of these, 200 (56.2%) farmers were visited. Out of the 200 farmers visited, 175 (87.5%) farmers met their targets. Manafwa was the poorest performing district in Mt. Elgon. The number of farmers in Mt Elgon region continue to be low. A summary of performance in Mt. Elgon according to the monitoring results is presented in Table 12.

Table 12: Performance of farmers in Mt Elgon as per district

District	Number of famers that met target	Number of farmers that did not meet target	Percentage of farmers that met target
Bulambuli	72	4	94.7%
Manafwa	14	10	58.3%
Mbale	17	3	85.0%
Sironko	72	8	90.0%
Total	**175**	**25**	**87.5%**

6.4. Corrective Actions

During the home visits, the results of the monitoring exercise are discussed between the monitoring teams and the farmers. The aim of this is to establish the challenges to plot management, causes of any issues or non-compliance, and corrective actions to apply (if necessary). The outcomes of the discussions are recorded to allow for appropriate follow-up with the individual farmers in the future. This interaction with the farmers enables the project to provide practical extension services, which helps the farmers to achieve the expected improved management milestones at the respective stages of the woodlot.

The farmers that did not qualify were advised to apply corrective actions. These were specific to the challenges faced by each farmer, and would have included one, or many, of the following:

- Replanting in the coming season for those who had lost their trees in fires or floods;
- Gap filling for the gardens that had poor spacing as well as replacement of lost seedlings;
- Weeding, slashing and thinning for those with bushy gardens;
- Plant additional trees for those whose trees were damaged by drought (these individuals were provided with free seedlings from the project);
- Reduce targets, if the initial targets were deemed to be over-ambitious.

Through these corrective actions, it is hoped that the farmers' performance is expected to improve by the time the next monitoring exercise is conducted.

In some instances, home visits revealed that the project participants had transferred land, either through sale or bequeathing (following the death of a farmer), and the new owners were not interested in continuing with the project.

6.5. Monitoring of Impact

6.5.1. Environmental Co-Benefits

The project also aims to measure its impact with regards to climate change adaptation, biodiversity enhancement, watershed services and renewable energy provision. Consequently, a summary of the project's current contribution to selected environmental co-benefits is presented in Table 13.

Table 13: A summary of project environmental impact indicators

Environmental dimension		Indicator	Value
1.	Biodiversity conservation	% of indigenous tree species planted (as opposed to naturalized species)	79%
2.	Protected area conservation	Number of protected areas covered by project	9
3.	Catchment condition	Number of catchments improved by the programme	7
4.	Climate resilience	Number of households with improved adaptation strategies	7,057

6.5.2. Socio-Economic Impact

In addition to the environmental benefits, the project delivers social and economic benefits. The project measures its impact in this area by monitoring per capita income as a result of carbon credit sales, jobs provided directly by the project, and tenure security. Consequently, a summary of the project's current contribution to selected socio-economic benefits is presented in Table 14. The contribution to governance benefits is presented by indicators in Table 15.

Table 14: A summary of project socio-economic impact indicators

Social Dimension	Indicator	Value
1. Livelihoods	Average smallholder household income as a result of PVC sales (USD)	668.91
2. Jobs	Number of employees, hired by the project- Full-time	22
	Number of employees, hired by the project- Part-time	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 (Ha)	193

Table 15: A summary of Project Governance Impact indicators

Governance Dimension	Indicator	Value
1. Social capital	Number of community groups created and/or supported by the project	70
	Number of community meetings supported by the project	55
	Number of participants in community meetings supported by the project	2,800
2. Project governance	ECOTRUST financial audits carried out (internal & external audits)	5
	Number of project meetings with farmer groups, & farmer coordinators	15
	Number of ECOTRUST Board of Trustees meetings	4

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 to where they hold individual accounts. For the reporting period, ECOTRUST has increased the use of the mobile money platform to make direct payments to farmers' SACCO, banks accounts, or directly to farmers mobile telephones. The Beyonic mobile platform enables ECOTRUST to complete transations from the project bank accounts, through the Beyonic mobile platforms and to the respective mobile phones. A total of USD 242,301 has been distributed to farmers across the districts through these facilities, and an additional USD 36,530 has been distributed in the form of seedlings.

Tables 16a & 16b show payment disbursements to farmers and seedling suppliers of the various project sites. The tables indicate if the payments were made through SACCOs or through the mobile money platform (Beyonic).

Table 16a: Summary of payments to producers in 2018

Date	Payee details	Amount (USD)
29/01/2018	P435922 Hoima farmer payments for year zero	11,717
04/04/2018	P476929 Hoima farmer payments	3,736
05/04/2018	P477535 & P477475 Hoima farmer payments	1,256
31/05/2018	P770191 Hoima farmer payments year zero	2,389
19/06/2018	P788454 Year zero farmer payments	327
04/07/2018	P828702 Hoima farmer payment	80
06/09/2018	Hoima farmer payments	97
Sub-total		**19,602**
29/08/2018	Ruboni community conservation	259
29/08/2018	Ruboni rural development sacco	548
29/08/2018	Kilembe intercommunity development sacco	153
29/08/2018	Ikongo sacco	67
21/08/2018	Ruboni sacco	11,248
21/08/2018	Kilembe inter cbo sacco	11,218
05/09/2018	Kasese carbon farmers mubuku intergrated	516
21/12/2018	Mifa sacco	26,752
21/12/2018	Kilembe intercommunity development sacco	6,526
27/12/2018	Mifa sacco	44,708
27/12/2018	Ruboni sacco	2,682
27/12/2018	Kilembe intercommunity development sacco	6,485
Sub-total		**111,162**
29/05/2018	Masindi year zero farmers	9,364
18/06/2018	P784150 Masindi Farmer payment year zero farmers	73

02/07/2018	P819831 Masindi farmer payments	159
06/09/2018	Masindi farmer payments	267
27/12/2018	Masindi farmer payments	20,401
Sub-total		**30,264**
17/07/2018	Elgon farmers sacco	1,040
09/02/2018	P441480/P442076/P442200 Mbale farmer payments	1,434
20/06/2018	P789072 Year Zero farmer payments	1,096
16/07/2018	P789072 Payment for zero farmers	82
27/12/2018	Mbale farmer payments	9,317
Sub-total		**12,970**
29/08/2018	Ruhinda north women's sacco	3,892
21/08/2018	Rutookye sacco	2,496
21/12/2018	Bitereko sacco	1,187
21/12/2018	Rutookye sacco	422
21/12/2018	Ruhinda north women's sacco	3,352
Sub-total		**11,349**
29/08/2018	Bunyaruguru development cooperative sacco	2,496
21/08/2018	Bunyaruguru sacco	9,236
21/08/2018	Kyamuhunga sacco	3,302
21/08/2018	Rubirizi farmers	12,386
22/08/2018	Bunyaruguru development sacco	6,742
21/12/2018	Bunyaruguru development sacco	14,936
21/12/2018	Kyamuhunga sacco	7,857
Sub-total		**56,955**
Overall total		**242,301**

Table 16b: Payments to seedlings suppliers in 2018

Date	District	Payee	Amount (UGX)	Amount (USD)
22/08/2018	Hoima	Bwambale Samuel	1,122,100	307
22/08/2018	Hoima	Abitegeka Wilfred	3,849,300	1055
22/08/2018	Hoima	Climate Alert & C0nservation Trust	2,642,500	724
22/08/2018	Hoima	Agaba Annet	4,236,750	1161
17/05/2018	Hoima	Sundry Persons	3,248,150	890
Sub-total			**15,098,800**	**4137**
19/05/2018	Kasese	Nyamutale Charles	10,717,000	2936
19/05/2018	Kasese	Beneco Ltd	10,885,000	2982
08/01/2018	Kasese	Beneco Ltd	4,134,000	1133
08/01/2018	Kasese	Nyamutale Charles	3,468,000	950
08/01/2018	Kasese	Nyamutale Charles	5,029,500	1378
08/01/2018	Kasese	Beneco Ltd	3,654,000	1001

06/07/2018	Kasese	Samson Bwambale	5,245,000	1437
06/07/2018	Kasese	Nyamutale Charles	9,551,500	2617
06/07/2018	Kasese	Beneco Ltd	11,019,400	3019
06/07/2018	Kasese	Augustine Kiiza	10,438,050	2860
09/01/2018	Kasese	Samson Bwambale	9,730,000	2666
Sub-total			**83,871,450**	**22978**
22/08/2018	Masindi	Kaahwa Kamanyire Solomon	1,179,500	323
22/08/2018	Masindi	Aganyira James	7,248,500	1986
22/08/2018	Masindi	Nyamaizi Fildah	5,131,000	1406
Sub-total			**13,559,000**	**3715**
06/07/2018	Bushenyi	Nelson Tugumenawe	11,235,350	3078
08/01/2018	Bushenyi	Nelson Tugumenawe	9,570,050	2622
Sub-total			**20,805,400**	**5700**
Overall Total			**133,334,650**	**36,530**

NB: The USD value is based on an average conversion rate from an analysis of 2018 currency rates up until 18/12/2018 by Barclays plc (available upon request)

7.2. Carbon Community Fund

Table 17 represents the in-kind grant provided in 2018 to the respective TGB project districts by the Carbon Community Fund (CCF). This grant was given in the form of silvicultural kits such as: Protective gears, axes, bow saws, flat files, triangular saws, DBH tape measures, Calipers, GPS devices, Suntto, and compasses, amongst other tools. These were procured using 2017 CCF (for further details on this fund, please refer to the updated PDD on the Plan Vivo website).

Table 17: Districts that received CCF in kind grant in 2018

District	Number of kits received
Kasese	22
Rubirizi	10
Mitooma	10
Masindi	18
Hoima	12
Mbale	8
Manafwa	3
Bududa	6
Namisindwa	2
Sironko	2
Bulambuli	4

8. Ongoing Community Participation

8.1. Introduction

The TGB programme recognizes that the process of continuously building social capital and facilitating knowledge/experience sharing is key to the overall success of this programme. The TGB project held participatory farmer trainings/sensitization meetings in all the sub counties/districts, where TGB is implemented. The main issues discussed in these training sessions and meetings included: Global warming, the Plan Vivo cycle, tree planting and carbon management. Farmers also discussed the challenges and threats in the community and together proposed possible solutions. This section highlights some of the issues discussed in these meetings.

8.2. Farmer Sensitization/Training and Participation

Induction meetings were held to motivate and encourage community members to join Trees for Global Benefits (TGB) programme. Prospective members are informed that, by joining the programme and growing trees, they can help mitigate the impacts of global warming and climate change, whilst also improving their livelihoods through carbon sales and the co-benefits of tree growing. The meetings not only attract new farmers but also strengthen the interest of the continuing members and their capacity to appropriately manage their already established trees. These training meetings are usually organized at the beginning of the first and/or second rain seasons of the year, so to allow adequate time for planning by the farmers.

In total, 55 training meetings were held in 2018 (16 in Mt Elgon region, 8 in Hoima, 9 in Masindi 15 in Kasese and 7 in Mitooma/Rubirizi districts). Through these, the project reached out to a total number of 2,297 people- *1,708* males, *589* females. Some of the subjects discussed in these meetings include, but were not limited to: Climate change/global warming, Plan Vivo cycles, carbon payments, Carbon Community Fund (CCF), climate smart agriculture practices etc.

In the Mt. Elgon region, the trainings were held between March/April, whilst in Hoima and Masindi, the trainings were conducted in July, and in Kasese, Mitooma and Rubirizi, the trainings were conducted in February 2018.

Table 18: Summary of participants per district

District	Sub-county	Parish/Venue	Number of males	Number of females	Total
Bududa	Bushigayi	Bumatanda	68	9	77
	Nakatsi	Bumusenyi	39	14	53
	Bukibokolo	Bunamuje	35	14	49
Mbale	Wanale	Bunatsoma	35	31	66
	Nyondo	Nyondo	17	12	29
	Budwale	Bunamahe	12	4	16
Bulambuli	Lusha	Bumwambu	43	13	56

	Bulegeni	Mbihi	23	4	27
	Lusha	Kiganda	22	2	24
Namisindwa	Bumbo	Buteteya	54	2	56
	Bumbo	Bumbo	21	4	25
Sironko	Budadiri T.C	Bunyodde	17	15	32
	Budadiri T.C	Kalawa	13	4	17
Manafwa	Khabutoola	Khabutoola	22	10	32
	Buwanagani	Bukhish	21	5	26
	Bukusu	Buwaya	18	4	22
Sub-total			**460**	**147**	**607**
Hoima	Kyangwali	Mahamba T.C	53	8	61
		Nsozi P/S	54	8	62
	Kabwooya	Karama T.C	36	3	39
		Kaigo P/S	29	12	41
	Kiziranfumbi/Buseruka	Nyairongo P/S	31	18	49
		Mr. Jovan's home	21	2	23
	Kigorobya/Kitoba	Bukoma Bright light	28	4	32
		Nyakabale	40	1	41
Sub-total			**292**	**56**	**348**
Masindi	Bwijanga	Isagara P/S	16	12	28
		Ntooma H/C	19	2	21
	Budongo	Nyantonzi COU	39	5	44
		Kisagura COU	38	14	52
	Pakanyi	Kihonda Demonstration farm	15	5	20
		Alimugonza COU	25	1	26
	Nyangahya	Kalyango P/S	5	2	7
		Nyangahya H/Q	16	11	27
	Karujubu	Kihuuba Catholic church	25	6	31
Sub-total			**198**	**58**	**256**
Kasese	Kyarumba		42	11	53
	Kilembe		40	15	55
	Mbunga		53	46	99
	Rwakingi		49	20	69
	Ruboni		54	34	88
	Nyangonge		53	28	81
	Katooke		41	28	69
	Kiruli		52	17	69
	Kabuyiri		32	18	50
	Kigoro		68	6	74
	Buhuhira		78	57	135
	Kinyabwamba		60	17	77
	Kyarumba[1]		81	18	99
	Kihindi		25	5	30
	Nduguthu		30	8	38
Subtotal			**758**	**328**	**1,086**
Overall total			**1708**	**589**	**2,297**

Issues/concerns that came from the meetings:

[1] 2nd training conducted in Kyarumba on 14th Feb 2018

- The project needs a sensitization programme focusing on the management of the trees after the 10 years;
- The timing of payments has improved but some sites continue to experience delays;
- The risk of land-grabbing in certain project areas has increased;
- The project must translate agreements and other documents into languages that are easier for the farmers to understand.

8.3. Feedback Meetings

Steered by the Executive Director, ECOTRUST held feedback meetings with TGB farmers in Mt Elgon region, and Masindi & Hoima districts. These were conducted in February 2018 for the Mt. Elgon sites and March 2018 for the Hoima & Masindi districts. Whilst the Mt. Elgon region meetings primarily targeted farmer representatives, the Hoima & Masindi district meetings were designed for all participants. The main objective of these meetings was to collect comments about the Trees for Global Benefits project (TGB), which could then be distilled into guidance. This guidance could then be used by project managers, and other staff members, to make informed decisions/changes in the future that will improve the project. The guiding questions for the sessions were: What is going well? What is not going well? And what can be done to improve the project?

The feedback received is expected to motivate and improve performance both for farmers and the secretariat.

Table 19: Summary of participants from the respective sites

District	Sub-county/Venue	Number of males	Number of females	Total
Hoima	Kiziranfumbi	48	14	62
	Kyangwali	64	10	74
	Kigorobya	23	0	23
	Kabwoya	47	6	53
Sub-total		**182**	**30**	**212**
Masindi	Kihaguzi	13	1	14
	Nyantonzi	54	5	59
	Kasenene	19	4	23
	Mihembero	22	2	24
	Nyangahya	36	9	45
	Kihuuba	39	15	54
	Kyamarolere	37	12	49
Sub-total		**220**	**48**	**268**
Bulambuli & Sironko	Bulambuli DLG Offices	8	1	9
Mbale, Manafwa, Namisindwa, and Bududa districts.	UWA offices, Mbale	13	1	14
Overall Total		**423**	**80**	**503**

The farmers raised the following as areas that require improvement:

- Timeliness in the monitoring/farm visits to individual farmers;
- The level of interaction between ECOTRUST and individual farmers;
- Access to quality seedlings;

- Support in the management of pests and diseases (see Section 2.3.2. for more information);
- The feedback mechanism between ECOTRUST and the individual Farmers needs to adapt to the growing number of farmers.

A number of mechanisms/solutions have been proposed to ensure that these issues are fully addressed. These include:

- Establishment of a feedback register to ensure that all issues are resolved in the shortest time possible;
- Support shall be provided for all farmers whose trees have been affected by pests, diseases and drought. This will be accomplished through the provision of seedlings for species in the Mixed Native Tree Species technical specification, so to also enable the farmers to transition away from the older *Maesopsis* technical specification;
- The project documents (with priority given to the contracts) shall be translated into a popular version with each farmer having a personalized copy that tracks progress.

8.4. Capacity Building for Host Communities in the Albertine Region on Impacts of the Tilenga Project

National Association of Environmental Specialists (NAPE) and ECOTRUST organized a capacity building meeting for community representatives of Buliisa, Masindi and Hoima districts. The meeting concerned the process and impact of the ongoing Tilenga project activities, with an objective to empower the PAPs (project affected persons) to effectively participate in the upcoming public hearing on Environmental and Social Impact Assessment of the project (ESIA). It is hoped that PAPs will consequently ask pertinent issues on livelihoods during the public hearing, be aware of the opportunity costs to their livelihoods, and have an informed conscience about the ESIA and how to deal with the related impacts. The capacity building was supported by the Shared Resources, Joint Solutions programme in Uganda.

A total number of 34 people participated in this meeting. Among these were the local leaders of the three districts, indigenous clans who were custodians of the natural heritage, and women and men whose farm land would directly be affected by the Tilenga Project.

Table 20: Summary of participants in the Tilenga Project capacity-building meetings

District	Number of Male participants	Number of Female participants	Total
Masindi	4	1	5
Hoima	7	1	8
Buliisa	15	6	21
Total	**26**	**8**	**34**

8.5. Exposure Visits for Entrepreneurial Skills Development and Sustainable Land-Use

In partnership with NAPE, AFIEGO, IUCN-UCO and IUCN-NL, ECOTRUST organized an exchange visit for the community groups of Masindi and Hoima districts between 27th-29th September 2018. This allowed them to experience hands-on training in entrepreneurial skills and sustainable land use, which is aimed at securing the provision of income generating activities for their welfare. 33 people (4 females, 29 male) were trained, including community leaders who play a vital role in ensuring sustainable use of resources at household and community levels.

During the field visit, the team interacted with farmers who had visited the Murchison landscape in 2017 to monitor progress. They observed the success stories, best practices and challenges encountered during the implementation of resolutions made (to improve the management of natural resources in their communities) during the 2017 visit. Participants also visited farmer groups in the Mitooma and Rubirizi districts, where they learnt about the flourishing nature-based enterprises such as honey processing, candles making from bees wax, wine and "waragi" processing. The group gained soil and water management skills to help sustainably utilize small land to produce food and commercial crops. For example, they learnt how to intercrop trees with crops, such as coffee, beans, bananas, and Vanilla among other crops. The groups visited were the *Ndangara* and *Kiyanga tutungukye*.

At the end of the exchange visit, each participant had created resolutions and an action plan. Progress made against these will be assessed in 2019.

8.6. Actions taken to address issues raised

8.6.1. Evidence-Based Advocacy

With support from the IUCN Netherlands Committee under the Shared Resources, Joint Solutions Programme, ECOTRUST launched an evidence-based advocacy programme. This aims to help farmers safeguard 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 exploration and developments for oil & gas, and sugarcane cultivation.

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

8.6.2. Landholdings & Monitoring

One of the key challenges in 2018 was managing the increased burden of monitoring due to the growing number of smallholders and scattered landholdings. The main strategy to overcome this has been the identification and engagement of local-based experts. These are individuals who are not farmers, but live in the project sites and can offer short term technical assistance for monitoring procedures. By identifying and engaging with these experts, the project expects to reduce the overall cost of monitoring.

The scattered landholdings have also increased the costs associated with recruitment of new participants and other forms of administrative actions. To mitigate these costs, the project has developed a strategy of group recruitment, whereby farmers in an area apply to the project and are recruited as a group. By implementing this strategy across the whole Mt. Elgon landscape, the number of farmers and land under improved management is expected to increase.

8.6.3. Technical Specifications

In February 2018, ECOTRUST conducted a follow-up meeting with TGB farmers in the Hoima and Masindi districts who had not met targets for a significant period of time, and therefore could not qualify for payments. In this follow-up, ECOTRUST aimed to understand the challenges to the farmers' performance and provide solutions that would enable them meet the agreed targets. The main challenges revolved around the implementation of activities that had been agreed during the pilot years of the project. One of the actions that ECOTRUST devised was to support the migration to the Mixed Species woodlots through provision of replacement seedlings. This approach has also been applied in other old project sites (Hoima, Masindi, Rubirizi & Mitooma) where *Maesopsis eminii* has experienced damage from pests and diseases, or affected by prolonged droughts.

8.6.4. Training in Tree-Based Enterprises

The project will invest in activities that build the capacity of farmers to manage tree-based enterprises. This activity will mainly focus on farmers that are in year 5 and beyond, who are experiencing a long lapse until their next payment from carbon credits, and need some finances to continue maintaining their trees. The income from tree-based enterprises is anticipated help fill their funding gaps.

8.6.5. Mobile Money Payments

Delays in payments, as a result of the long-time spent processing transactions, had earlier been identified as one of the issues that has been demotivating farmers. The main reasons for these delays in payments include the amount of time spent analyzing the monitoring information, the inability of some farmers to access financial institutions (including micro-finance), and delay caused by some farmers providing incorrect

payment information. To help overcome this issue, the project subscribed to a Mobile Application-based system (Beyonic) through which farmers can be paid.

9. *Breakdown of Operational Costs*

Below is a breakdown of all operational costs connected to the project for the reporting period. The project has continued to enjoy significant support from donors, with the majority of co-funding coming from the Dutch Government through the Netherlands Committee of IUCN.

Table 21: Breakdown of operational costs

2018 costs	Total Cost (USD)	Carbon sales (USD)	Other sources (USD)	Notes
3rd party Verification	**42,409**	**38,963**	**3,445**	IUCN NL
Staff time	**319,157**	**95,579**	**223,578**	IUCN NL, internal sources
Farmer capacity building	**37,139**	**37,139**	**0**	
Monitoring	**78,742**	**78,742**	**0**	
Office running costs	**107,191**	**52,146**	**55,044**	IUCN NL, Busara,
Vehicle running costs	**23,548**	**12,128**	**11,420**	
Research & Project Development	**58,633**	**5,616**	**53,016**	
Coordinators	**4,297**	**4,297**	**0**	IUCN NL
Other travel	**33,718**	**247**	**33,471**	
Total	**704,834**	**324,857**	**379,974**	

10. Future Development

10.1. Farmer Field Schools

The project will continue training farmers to complete the project operations in addition to the establishment and management of tree-based enterprises. The capacity building will continue to focus primarily on empowering and teaching farmer leaders the skills necessary to conduct Farmer Field Schools. Through this approach, these leaders will be able to build the capacity of fellow farmers.

10.2. New Technical Specifications

Some farmers have faced challenges in successfully implementing the new technical specification. This has been due to a number of reasons, such as harsh weather conditions. In some instances, difficulty has been caused by cultural beliefs attached to certain tree species. For example, farmers will not plant *Terminalia Spp* because they believe that, if one grows, the head of the family will die. This has been experienced mostly in warm and hilly areas of Kasese. In these regions, farmers have preferred to plant mostly *Grevillea robusta*, because it grows fast, has the ability to persist during long dry spells, and has no negative cultural connotations. ECOTRUST therefore intends to develop the *Grevillea robusta* species technical specification to facilitate the desires of these farmers.

The project will continue supporting some of the old farmers who have not migrated to the new technical specifications. This scenario is common in the Hoima, Masindi & Mitooma districts, since many farmers in these districts registered in the early years of the TGB project.

10.3. Farmer Feedback Register

In February and March 2018, the Executive Director steered feedback meetings with TGB farmers in Mt Elgon region, Masindi and Hoima districts. The main objective of these meetings was to gather comments about the TGB project from which decisions can be made to help improve the project. One concern raised was that there are communication gaps between ECOTRUST and individual farmers. ECOTRUST has therefore decided to develop and implement a feedback register as a solution to address this.

10.4. Mobile App

A mobile App has been developed to increase the efficiency of monitoring. The App will be used to support real time submission of farmer information into the database. The use of mobile devices is expected to significantly reduce the turnaround time for processing monitoring results that lead to the payments.

10.5. Farmer Information Booklet

Farmers and farmer coordinators have been requesting a mechanism for feedback on how the project is performing generally. Normally, the project shares performance information during the annual farmer representative meetings. However, once a year was deemed insufficient. The farmers requested that meetings should be held to discuss the results of the recently concluded monitoring. These meetings should highlight the performance of individual farmers and the implications in terms of expected payments and potential areas of improvement. The project has therefore held feedback meetings, during which performance at the sub-county level was discussed. However, it was decided that feedback on individual farmer performance not be disclosed within these groups, but instead provided on an individual basis to the respective farmers. The project has also designed farmer information booklets, where any changes regarding farmer status, resulting from the monitoring, can be updated on a regular basis.

11. APPENDICES

Appendix I: List of Buyers Since Project Inception

Year of Sale	Buyer	tCO_2 Purchased	Total Sale (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	
2010	COTAP	1,169	
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	
2014	COTAP	292	
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	
2016	Zero Mission	3,400	
2016	Zero Mission	3,283	
2017	Zero Mission (Max)	57,092	
2017	Zero Mission (Max)	50,121	
2017	Zero Mission	2200	
2017	Zero Mission (Antalis, etc)	768	
2017	Zero Mission	1,520	
2017	Uganda Carbon Bureau (Classic Africa)	52	
Sub-total		**1,111,486**	
2018	ZeroMission Max	79,503	
2018	ZeroMission	9,135	
2018	ZeroMission	3,500	
2018	Uganda Carbon Bureau	51	
2018	Myclimate	10,000	
2018	ZeroMission Max	62,275	
2018	COTAP	2,177	
2018	Uganda Carbon Bureau	207	
Sub-total		**166,848**	
	Total	**1,278,334**	**$7,367,090.85**

Total PVCs after 2018 issuance	**1,327,886**

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

a) A List of Collaborative Forest Management Groups Participating in TGB or Whose Capacity to Monitor Threats to Forestry Has Been Built

1. Buzenga Environmental Conservation Association (BUECA)
2. Ndangaro Environmental Conservation Association (NECA)
3. Butoha Tusherure Ebyabuzire Association (BUTEA)
4. Mwogyera Parish Environmental Conservation Association (MPECA)
5. Katanda Tree Growers Association (KATGA)
6. Rwazere Tree Growers Association (RTGA)
7. Kanywambogo Development Association
8. Bitooma Abeteritine Twabeisheho Association
9. Nyarugote CFM
10. swazi nitubasa CFM
11. Mubuku Integrated Farmer's Association (CFM)
12. Ndangara Nyakiyanja Tutungukye group (CFM)
13. Rwoburunga Bahigi Tulinde Obwobuhangwa
14. Kapeeka Integrated Community Devt Association (KICODA)
15. Siiba Environmental Conservation and Development Association
16. Nyakase Environmental Conservation and Development Association (NECODA)
17. Karujubu Forest Adjacent Communities Association (KAFACA)
18. Budongo Good Neighbours Conservation Association (BUNCA)
19. North Budongo Forest Communities Association (NOBUFOCA)
20. Kidoma Conservation and Development Association (KICODA)
21. Kaseeta Tugende Omumaiso Association
22. Kabwoya Environmental Conservation Development Association (KEDA)
23. Kyangwali Twimukye Association

b) A Table of Communal Land Associations Established with Support from ECOTRUST

Name of community forest	Area under management (Ha)	Name of Communal Land Association (CLA)
Ongo	193	Ongo Communal Land Association
Alimugonza	35	Alimugonza Communal Land Association

c) A List of Resource User Groups, Whose Agreements Were Facilitated and/or Supported by ECOTRUST

1. Bunaiga Resource User Group
2. Kisamba 11 Resource User Group
3. Mbunga Resource User Group
4. Bunyandiko Resource User Group
5. Katunguru Women resource user Group
6. Kayanja Resource User Group
7. Katwe Tourism Integrated Community (KATIC)
8. Kikorongo womens group

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

Kasese District

1. Ruboni Community Conservation Group
2. Kilembe intercommunity organisation
3. kigoro carbon farmers group
4. kabaka water user group
5. Buhuhira ex hunters group
6. Kinyabwamba carbon farmers

Mitooma/Rrubirizi Districts

1. Katanda carbon farmers group
2. Bitereko Carbon Farmers Group
3. Kiyanga Environmental Conservation Association

Masindi District

1. Karujubu Fruit growers and environmental conservation association (KAFECA).

Bududa District

1. Nakatsi Carbon Farmers' Group
2. Bukibokolo Carbon Farmers Saving Group
3. Bwahata carbon farmers saving group

Mbale District

1. Bubetye Carbon Farmers Association (registered at district)
2. Nabumali Tree Planting Group
3. Nyondo Farmers development Group
4. Bufukhula Beekeeping farmers group

Manafwa District

1. See light Ahead Association (registered at district)
2. Bubetye Integrated Farmers Group (registered at district)
3. Khaukha Carbon farmers' group
4. Bushuiu carbon farmer's group

e) Parish Adaptation Groups in Bulambuli & Sironko

District	Sub-county	Parish Adaptation Committee	Catchment
Bulambuli	Lusha (upstream)	Kinganda	River Sissiyi
		Bumwambu	

		Jewa	
	Bulegeni (downstream)	Muvule	
		Mbigi	
		Samazi	
Sironko	Bugitimwa (upstream)	Elgon	River Sironko
		Kisali	
		Bugitimwa	
	Budadiri (downstream)	Kalawa Cell	
		Nakiwondwe	
		Bunyodde	

F) CBOs with Conservation Agreements

Masindi District (Kiiha Catchment)

1. Kiiha – Kacukura Wetland Conservation Association (KIKAWECA)
2. Kasubi, Kabango, Mubende Wetland Conservation Association (KAKAMUWECA)