Trees for Global Benefits

2019 Plan Vivo Annual Report

Submitted:

Approved:

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:	support@ecotrust.or.ug
Website:	www.ECOTRUST.or.ug

1. *Summary*

Project overview	
Reporting period	**January to December 2019**
Geographical areas	**Albertine Rift** (Rubirizi, Mitooma, Kasese, Hoima, Masindi, Kitagwenda Districts) **Mt. Elgon** (Mbale, Manafwa, Bududa, Bulambuli, Sironko, Namisindwa Districts)
Technical specifications in use	***Maesopsis Eminii*** – Original technical specification (applied until 2014) ***Mixed Native Spp.*** – Ver1 Approved 1st April 2016 (applied until 2018) 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) ***Mixed Native Spp.*** – Ver2 Approved 1st April 2020 This technical specification comprises three different systems: [2] - Boundary Planting (carbon potential 93.09 tCO_2/ha equivalent to 232.73 tCO_2/Km) - Dispersed Interplanting (carbon potential 196.91 tCO_2/ha) - Woodlots (carbon potential 259.91 tCO_2/ha)

Project indicators	Historical (2003-2018)	Added/ Issued this period (2019)	Total
Number of smallholder households with PES agreements	6996	2000	8996
Number of community groups with PES agreements (where applicable) by Dec 2019	83	2	85
Approximate number of households (or individuals) in these community groups	435	60	495
Number of employees, hired by the project- Full-time	22	0	22
Number of employees, hired by the project- Part-time	69	21	90
Number of Village Savings & Loans Associations supported by TGB	21	2	23
Number of commercial nurseries supported by TGB	22	2	24
Number of Community – Based Organizations supported by TGB	73	0	73
Area under management (ha) where PES agreements are in place (includes boundary planting)	6512.19	1131.87	7644.06
Total PES payments made to participants (USD)	$2,737,112.82	$283,803.53	$3,020,916.35
Average smallholder household income as a result of PVC sales (USD)	n/a	n/a	$623.72
Total sum held in trust for future PES payments (USD)	$1,942,569	$647,476.06	$2,590,045.06
Saleable emissions reductions achieved this period (tCO_2)		290,947	
Adjustments corresponding to previous years (tCO_2)		-28,663	
Total saleable emissions reductions (tCO_2)	1,327,886	262,284	1,590,170
Allocation to Plan Vivo buffer account (tCO_2)	147,543	29,143	176,686
Unsold Stock at time of submission (PVC)			
Vintage 2014	18	0	18
Vintage 2016	24,295	-16,415	7,880
Vintage 2017	5,525	-2,878	2,647
Vintage 2018	19,714	-17,639	2,075
Vintage 2019 (current request)		72,882	72,882
Total Unsold Stock (PVC)			85,502
Plan Vivo Certificates (PVCs) issued to date			**1,327,886**
Plan Vivo Certificates requested for issuance (2019 Vintage)			**262,284**
Total PVCs issued (including this report)			**1,590,170**

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

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

Table of Contents

List of Tables

2. *Key Events/Developments and Challenges*

Trees for Global Benefits (TGB) is a cooperative carbon offsetting scheme that links rural poor smallholder farmers in Uganda to the voluntary carbon market using the Plan Vivo Standard. TGB, which started in 2003 in Rubirizi and Mitooma districts, has through the years shown exceptional performance through the different innovations that involve the farmers, recruiting of more communities into the project and introducing new activities along with the tree planting.

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 into action. 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 the activities implemented in the project year January through to December 2019.

2.1. Key Events*/developments*

2.1.1 ECOTRUST Celebrates Two Decades of Conservation Financing

ECOTRUST held its celebrations to mark 20 years of its existence during its annual public stakeholders' event in November 2019 at the Mestil Hotel with the theme: **Green Finance: Investing for Climate Resilience**. The annual Stakeholders' event is celebrated every year and brings together different stakeholders that include the farmer leaders, Donors, Private Sector and Government representatives to discuss progress and find strategies for improving programme delivery.

During the event, ECOTRUST showcased some of the innovations that have enabled the organization to achieve its goal: *to provide sustained funding for conservation.* In line with this goal, the organization launched three major funds for climate resilience:

i. The Green Investments Venture Fund (GIVES), which will accelerate investment in climate-resilient projects that promote restoration of landscapes in Uganda. The fund will support innovative projects and solutions that reduce deforestation and promote natural resources management.
ii. The Climate Resilience Insurance Fund (CRIF) to address the comprehensive risk management needs of vulnerable people by drawing lessons from, and building on, the Community Carbon Fund.
iii. Corridor-Restoration Fund which is focused on restoring the connectivity of Budongo-Bugoma forest wildlife corridor.

These three funds are being run under the Mobilizing More for Climate (MOMO4C) programme whose objective is to develop, test and scale up landscape programs for climate resilient agriculture and forestry through development of business cases, financial

instruments and document models and strengthening of the enabling conditions. The MoMo4C programme is supported by the Dutch Government, through the IUCN Netherlands Committee.

The TGB programme was also showcased using interactive story maps, workshops and panel discussions that involved everyone that attended the event on topics including forest tenure & management, financial & digital inclusion for smallholder-led agro-forestry etc. Community representatives from all project sites received dummy cheques representing 2019 payments made to different communities involved in the project. Certificates of appreciation for service were given to Carbon Buyers, Partner Organizations and past Board Chairmen.

2.1.2 Two Additional Community Based Organizations (CBOs)

The project focuses on improving livelihoods of community members without leaving anyone out of the development cycle. These groups are nonprofit groups that work at local level to improve their lives and those of the community at large in areas of health quality, environment, access & delivery of small loans and information. The year 2019, saw two CBOs formed in Kasese District namely: Kuhure Farmers' Cooperative that recruited 400 farmers into the project and Kyarumba Banywani Tree Farmers Cooperative Savings that recruited 700 farmers into the project bringing the total number of CBOs under TGB to 85 and in Kasese in particular to 15 CBOs.

The organization of communities in form CBOs is very critical for climate resilience since they increase the social bond among communities and create a safety net for communities in case of any shocks. The members are assured of mutual support in the event of a force majeure event. Mobilizing the communities through these CBOs also has a potential to improve adoption rate.

2.1.6 Improvements in Feedback & Grievance Redress

In order to strengthen the project ability to respond to the feedback generated from the project's activities, the project has introduced a feedback register to help the programme coordinators track and report on any feedback they receive from the farmers. The register has been very useful in improving service delivery to the farmers and eliminate the issue of farmers feeling like their issues are not taken seriously in order to improve the relationship between the farmers and the ECOTRUST staff. This also encourages some level of transparency between the two parties.

2.1.7 Mobile Application to Support monitoring

An online and offline mobile application has been created for the tree monitoring exercises that ECOTRUST has been involved in for the past 15 years for the TGB programme. This is an upgrade from the paper system that has previously been in use and will support farmer recruitment and monitoring. A data collection tool for recruitment,

monitoring, inventorying and reporting of the tree farmers is linked to an online database in which reports and analyses are produced regarding performance of the individual farmers.
The new database system offers a wider range of security as compared to the original paperwork that can inevitably degrade in the long run.

10 handheld devices (Samsung tablets) that house the mobile application were procured according to the specifications provided by the development consultant. The offline application and online database were pre-tested by 13 technicians that comprised of Programme Coordinators and Programme assistants in Hoima district to ensure it meets the needs for its creation. The application has also been used for monitoring of about 600 farmers from Kasese district for farmers of all monitoring years and it was reported to reduce time spent on a farm taking records, hence it is efficient. The application development is being finalized and should be completed in 2020.

2.1.8 Biodiversity & Climate Resilience

With a grant from the Uganda Biodiversity Fund, ECOTRUST implemented the Biodiversity for Climate Resilience project around Bugoma Central Forest Reserve that started in February 2019 and closed in September 2019. Among the big milestones of the six-month project was the review and inclusion of carbon credit benefits into the CFM Agreements. NFA allocated 78 Ha of land zoned for collaborative forest management to the CFM members to plant indigenous trees for carbon sequestration under the Plan Vivo Standard. An additional 10,539.86 Ha of the Bugoma CFR were placed under three forest management plans. The CFM members carry out voluntary patrols to reduce threats to biodiversity and improve the integrity of the forest reserve. Under the same UBF project, 334 Ha of domesticated woodlots were planted by the small holder farmers in Kikuube district on their own land. 40,000 tCO_2e carbon emission reduction certificates were issued, the farmers were reviewed, monitored and some have been paid under the TGB programme.

2.2 Capacity building

2.2.1 Staff Capacity Building

To increase interaction with the farmers, ECOTRUST has increased on the number of program assistants to carryout monitoring as a routine activity. The organization has contracted community-based monitors on short-term contracts. ECOTRUST conducted a series of capacity building events targeting the old and new field staff from all the project sites; Rubirizi/Mitooma, Masindi, Hoima/Kikuube.

2.2.2 Outcome harvesting training

Outcome harvesting is defined as a participatory monitoring and evaluation methodology to identify, analyze and learn from outcomes/ changes that a programme influences or produces. The monitoring and evaluation team, along with the programmes team

undertook the training to improve skills to observe and document programme changes. Outcome harvesting captures change that was meant to be caused by the programme in any given area or any changes that could have happened unexpectedly due to the influence of the programme in a particular area. The training focused on learning how to collect evidence for these changes, understanding the process of the change occurring i.e. who was changed, when and where did the change occur. Mostly for the TGB programme, the outcome harvesting for the year was based on change in practice and behavior and a few policies. The changes were documented during the year and these included the interest of females in joining the TGB programme, which led to the recruitment of female farmer coordinators, which contributes to gender inclusion. Another change was observed among the National Forestry Authority (NFA), which manages over 500 Central Forest Reserves. NFA accepted the beneficiary communities of the Collaborative Forest Management (CFM) Agreements around Bugoma and Budongo CFRs to include carbon credit benefits in the CFM agreements. These CFM Agreements did not contain the Carbon Sequestration Addendum at the time of their development in 2009. The carbon benefits increase the allegiance for the conservation of the target forest reserves hence reducing operational costs incurred by NFA. Furthermore, the communities holding the Agreements increase their financial benefits from non-timber forest products.

2.2.3 Farmer field schools

The project has started process of converting model farms into Farmer Field Schools (FFS). The farmer field schools are defined as a group-based learning process where farmers come together to share knowledge, skills and experience with less contact with the extension worker. Farmer Field Schools are a peer-to-peer learning approach that is expected to provide opportunities for farmer-to-farmer learning and technology transfer, thus improving performance. This kind of concept is meant to improve service delivery to the farmers by helping the farmers come together and learn from a “model farmer”, discuss challenges like poor spacing and come up with solutions. The farmer coordinators, along with the Programme assistants/ Programme Coordinators, identify the model farms in which the training will be done. The model farms are owned by the farmers who have shown exemplary performance right from seedling level to tree planting and growth.

During the farmer field school trainings, the farmers are taken through topics such as lining out, spacing, pitting and planting of trees, weeding, pruning and thinning of the trees. In 2019, nine farmer field schools were established in the Mt Elgon region, nine in Masindi and 13 were identified in Kasese district.

2.3. Key challenges

2.3.1. The high cost of Monitoring scattered small holdings

Although the cost of monitoring has reduced compared to last year, the growing number of smallholders and scattered landholdings especially in Kasese and Mt. Elgon regions still

presented a major challenge in 2019. These two regions have very steep terrain due to Mt. Rwenzori in Kasese and Mt. Elgon in the Mt. Elgon region. A combination of the two factors (small holdings & steep terrain) increases the cost of monitoring as well as that of recruitment.

It is expected that the strengthening of group recruitment coupled with the introduction of a Mobile Monitoring Application will contribute greatly to a reduction in cost of monitoring.

2.3.2. Pests & Diseases

Maesopsis monocultures have continued to suffer pest attacks, as observed in the Masindi district where a potentially new pest was seen affecting the trees and causing gummosis among the *Maesopsis* woodlots. The pests bore through the stems and cause the trees to break when wind blows. The tree damage affects the targets of the farmers by making them miss payments. Another challenge facing the *Maesopsis* monoculture sites in Mitooma, Rubirizi and Masindi districts is dieback at about 5 years of growth. The programme will continue to engage with Makerere University College of Forestry to find a lasting solution to the pests and diseases. In the interim, ECOTRUST has encouraged farmers to thin out the affected trees and migrate to the Mixed Species technical Specifications to increase the tree diversity and break the life cycle of the pests.

In Kasese, the farmers still face challenges of termites attacking and destroying *Grevillea robusta spp*. The termites attack *Grevillea* at any age which has dispirited farmers causing poor performance. The farmers end up incurring additional costs like purchasing seedlings in order to meet their targets. The program has continued to engage with these farmers advising them to maintain their gardens/woodlots through spot weeding, proper pruning and selective thinning (removal of the diseased trees). Farmers whose trees were 5 years old and above were marked to be thinned out thus improving on the health of trees in their woodlots.

2.3.3 Rural Electrification and Feeder Road Construction

Seventeen farmers in Maliba, Bugoye, Karusandara and Kiliembe all sub counties in Kasese district have been affected by road construction, rural electrification and hydro power line expansion. The project will provide planting materials / tree seedlings to affected farmers to compensate for the lost trees.

3. Activities, total project size and participation

3.1 Current Technical Specifications

The project has continued to use the *Maesopsis eminii* technical specification as well as the Mixed Native Spp. technical specification (Ver1 & 2), in boundary, woodlot and intercropping systems. The mixed native technical specifications have been reviewed in the year 2019 and below are the revised Net benefit tCo_2. The crediting period has also been revised from 25 years to 35 years. The new values obtained have been used in the year 2019 certificate issuances.

Table 1: Net tCO2 and Tradeable tCO2

Intervention Type	Sink tCO2/ha	Baseline tCO2/ha	Net benefits tCO2/ha	Risk Buffer (10%) tCO2/ha	Tradeable Carbon tCO2/ha
Boundary planting	109.76	16.68	93.08	9.31	83.77
Woodlot planting	276.59	16.68	259.91	25.99	233.92
Dispersed inter-planting	213.60	16.68	196.91	19.69	177.22

All new farmers are being recruited under the Mixed Native Spp technical Specifications version 2 in woodlot, dispersed interplanting and boundary planting**.** In the regions where the *Maesopsis eminii* technical specification has failed, farmers have been 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 spp. technical Specifications.

During the 2019 reporting period, the project gave approval to a total of **2,404** farmers expected to bring **1,399.34 Ha** of farmland under improved management using the Mixed Native Spp. technical specification. Table 2 below provides a summary of farmers who were given the go ahead to plant.

Table 2: Showing farmers given ago ahead to plant per district

Sub/county	No. of Farmers	Ha to be planted	Total tCO2	Saleable tCO2	Target No of Expected trees
Dispersed Interplanting					
Bududa	61	19.07	3755.07	3379.57	5911.7
Bulambuli	83	20.01	3940.17	3546.15	6203.1
Manafwa	42	6.070	1195.24	1075.72	2067.7
Mbale	253	72.30	14236.59	12812.93	22504.8
Sironko	89	16.49	3247.05	2922.34	5111.9
Total	**528**	**133.94**	**26374.13**	**23736.71**	**41799.2**
Mixed Native Woodlot					
Bududa	2	0.25	64.98	58.48	100.0
Bulambuli	1	0.10	25.99	23.39	40.0
Hoima	39	33.75	8771.96	7894.77	13320.0
Kasese	1158	652.0147	169465.14	152518.63	260805.9
kikuube	160	138.08	35888.37	32299.54	51535.0
Kitagwenda	31	31.00	8057.21	7251.49	12400.0
Manafwa	7	1.07	278.10	250.29	428.0
Masindi	358	250.13	65011.29	58510.16	99593.0
Mbale	9	2.07	538.01	484.21	828.0
Rubirizi	110	156.90	40779.88	36701.89	62760.0
Sironko	1	0.04	10.40	9.36	16.0
Total	**1876**	**1265.40**	**328891.34**	**296002.20**	**501825.9**
Grand Total	**2404**	**1399.34**	**355265.46**	**319738.91**	**543625.1**

4.0 Submission for Plan Vivo Certificate Issuance

During the reporting period, a total of **2,233** farmers were monitored for year 0. Of the monitored farmers, **2,130 farmers** qualified and were recruited into the programme (compared to 944 recruited in 2018) representing 88.6% of the 2,404 farmers who were given a go-ahead to plant. This brought **1,274.63 Ha** of farmland under improved management (compared to 625.0ha in 2018), using the Mixed Native Spp technical specification.

The majority of the farmers were recruited from Kasese District (1140 farmers), which accounts for 53.5% of the recruited farmers. Being mountainous, the Kasese district has a vast amount of fertile land available for tree planting and the farmers are more than willing to join the project as they have witnessed success stories from farmer testimonies that have joined the project over the years. The number of farmers from Mt. Elgon has continued to increase significantly from 255 farmers in 2018 to 421 farmers in 2019 because of increased interest, awareness of the TGB project and the associated benefits such as sustainable land management (e.g. reduced runoff in mountainous areas).

Table 3 provides the breakdown per district and sub-county; table 4 gives a breakdown according to technical specifications; and table 5 summarizes the Plan Vivo Certificate issuances for the reporting period.

Table 3: Summary Recruitment per Technical Specification per District

Sub/county	No. of Farmers	Ha to be planted	No. of trees monitored	Target No. of trees to be monitored	Total tCO_2	Saleable tCO_2
QUALIFIED						
MIXED NATIVE WOODLOT						
Kasese						
Bugoye	147	78.90	15396	31560	20506.90	18456.21
Buhuhira	67	45.74	13151	18298	11889.50	10700.55
Kaghema	2	1.00	300	400	259.91	233.92
Karusandara	1	0.70	140	280	181.94	163.74
Kilembe	1	0.50	94	200	129.96	116.96
Kisinga	147	74.30	15760	29720	19311.31	17380.18
Kitswamba	9	8.50	1617	3400	2209.24	1988.31
Kyabarugira	1	1.00	299	400	259.91	233.92
Kyarumba	349	182.12	36811	72848	47334.81	42601.33
Kyondo	101	51.90	10386	20760	13489.33	12140.40
Mahango	4	1.95	392	780	506.82	456.14
Maliba	234	150.60	31691	60240	39142.45	35228.20
Rukoki	10	6.50	2319	2600	1689.42	1520.47
Ibanda-Kyanya TC	25	12.60	2540	5040	3274.87	2947.38

Ibanda ward	1	0.50	96	200	129.96	116.96
Kahokya	38	23.50	4928	9400	6107.89	5497.10
Lake Katwe	2	1.00	192	400	259.91	233.92
Nyamwamba	1	0.50	100	200	129.96	116.96
Kasese	**1140**	**641.81**	**136212**	**256726**	**166814.06**	**150132.65**
Hoima						
Buseruka	1	0.50	203	200	129.96	116.96
Kabwoya	2	2.00	284	800	519.82	467.84
Kigorobya	35	27.50	6693	11001	7147.53	6432.77
Kitoba	9	9.50	2348	3920	2469.15	2222.23
Hoima	**47**	**39.50**	**9528**	**15921**	**10266.45**	**9239.80**
Kikuube						
Bugambe	6	6.00	1300	1633	1559.46	1403.51
Buseruka	4	3.50	1323	1400	909.69	818.72
Kabwoya	21	22.50	5117	8370	5847.98	5263.18
Kigorobya	1	1.00	221	400	259.91	233.92
Kiziranfumbi	76	58.20	13545	22515	15126.76	13614.09
Kyangwali	51	45.95	11089	17711	11942.86	10748.58
Kikuube	**159**	**137.15**	**32596**	**52029**	**35646.66**	**32081.99**
Masindi						
Bwijanga	30	27.30	7161	10920	7095.54	6385.99
Karujubu	11	8.30	2920	3230	2157.25	1941.53
Miirya	69	47.20	13661	18700	12267.75	11040.98
Nyangahya	46	37.40	10199	14960	9720.63	8748.57
Pakanyi	65	47.65	13999	19060	12384.71	11146.24
Budongo	56	35.80	12935	14320	9304.78	8374.30
Masindi	**277**	**203.65**	**60875**	**81190**	**52930.67**	**47637.60**
Mbale						
Wanale	9	2.26	919	904	587.40	528.66
Mbale	**9**	**2.26**	**919**	**904**	**587.40**	**528.66**
Rubirizi						
Ryeru	45	90.00	18918	36000	23391.90	21052.71
Rubirizi	**45**	**90.00**	**18918**	**36000**	**23391.90**	**21052.71**
Kitagwenda						
Buhanda	30	30.00	5983	12000	7797.30	7017.57
Mahyoro	1	1.00	189	400	259.91	233.92
Kitagwenda	**31**	**31.00**	**6172**	**12400**	**8057.21**	**7251.49**
Manafwa						
Bukhadala	1	0.25	93	100	64.98	58.48
Manafwa T.C	1	0.60	135	240	155.95	140.35
Khabutoola	4	0.63	233	252	163.74	147.37
Manafwa	**6**	**1.48**	**461**	**592**	**384.67**	**346.20**
Bududa						
Bukibokolo	1	0.30	590	120	77.97	70.18
Nakatsi	2	0.25	189	100	64.98	58.48
Bududa	**3**	**0.55**	**779**	**220**	**142.95**	**128.66**
Mixed Native Woodlot Total	**1717**	**1147.40**	**266460**	**455981**	**298221.96**	**268399.76**
DISPERSED PLANTING						

Mbale						
Wanale	189	52.29	11850	16210	10296.42	9266.78
Budwale	54	18.55	4082	5813	3652.68	3287.41
Mbale	**243**	**70.84**	**15932**	**22022**	**13949.10**	**12554.19**
Bukhadala	11	3.01	525	933	592.70	533.43
Manafwa T.C	32	12.94	2854	4011	2548.02	2293.21
Khabutoola	32	4.02	1125	1246	791.58	712.42
Manafwa	**75**	**19.97**	**4504**	**6191**	**3932.29**	**3539.06**
Namisindwa						
Bukokho	23	12.08	3029	3745	2378.67	2140.81
Bumbo	15	5.29	1349	1640	1041.65	937.49
Namisindwa	**38**	**17.37**	**4378**	**5385**	**3420.33**	**3078.29**
Bududa						
Bukibokolo	23	7.38	2125	2288	1453.20	1307.88
Nakatsi	33	10.97	2908	3401	2160.10	1944.09
Bududa	**56**	**18.35**	**5033**	**5689**	**3613.30**	**3251.97**
Masindi						
Bwijanga	1	0.70	203	217	137.84	124.05
Masindi	**1**	**0.70**	**203**	**217**	**137.84**	**124.05**
Dispersed Total	**413**	**127.23**	**30050**	**39503**	**25052.86**	**22547.57**
GRAND TOTAL QUALIFIED	**2130**	**1274.63**	**296510**	**495485**	**323274.81**	**290947.33**

Table 4: Summary of issuance per technical specification

Planting System	No. of Farmers	Ha to be planted	Monitored trees	Target No. of Trees to be planted	Total tCO_2	Saleable tCO_2
Mixed Native Spp Woodlot	1717	1147.40	266460	455981	298221.96	268399.76
Mixed Native Spp Dispersed Interplanting	413	127.23	30050	39503	25052.86	22547.57
	2130	**1274.63**	**296510**	**495484**	**323274.81**	**290947.33**

Table 5: Summary of Plan Vivo Certificate (PVC) issuance request

Factor	Value	Calculation
Qualified total tCO2	323275	A
Total saleable tCO_2	290947	B = A*0.9
Set aside for buffer allocation & replacements	32327	
Prior year adjustments	28663	C
Saleable tCO2 available for issuance (90%)	262284	D = B-C
Net contribution to buffer account this period	29143	=D/9

5. *Sales of Plan Vivo Certificates*

During the annual reporting period (2019), the project has sold 226,334 tCO_2 (up from 166,848tCO_2 tCO_2 in 2018) to various buyers, as indicated in Table 6 below. This includes 189,402 tCO_2 from new issuances (vintage 2019), and 36,932 tCO_2 from existing vintages of stock.

Table 6: Sales for the reporting period January to December 2019

Vintage	Name of purchaser/source of funds	Number of PVCs purchased	Price per certificate (USD)	Total amount received (USD)
2016	Myclimate	10000		
2016	ZeroMission	6,415		
Subtotal		**16415**		
2017	COTAP	2644		
2017	Institute for Sustainable Environment (Clarkson University)	234		
Subtotal		**2878**		
2018	ZeroMission	2,000		
2018	ZeroMission	3,200		
2018	ZeroMission	2,488		
2018	ZeroMission	3,151		
2018	ZeroMission Max Norway	3,005		
2018	ZeroMission	97		
2018	ZeroMission Max Norway	3,534		
2018	ZeroMission	164		
Subtotal		**17,639**		
2019	Uganda Carbon Bureau (Jim Turbull)	11		
2019	Kampala Food Network	38		
2019	Classic Africa	51		
2019	ZeroMission	30,000		
2019	ZeroMission Max Hamburger	80,628		
2019	ZeroMission Max Hamburger	76,995		
2019	ZeroMission (Äventyrsresor)	1,679		
Subtotal		**189,402**		
Total sales in 2019		**226,334**		

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

Total sales of Plan Vivo Certificates stand at 1,504,668 tCO_2 broken down as follows:

Table 7: Total number of certificates sold since project inception

Year	tCO_2	Average price/tCO_2 (USD)	Total price (USD)
Pre-2008	59,093		

2008	80,428		
2009	38,700		
2010	80,896		
2011	82,298		
2012	148,411		
2013	34,598		
2014	179,872		
2015	257,842		
2016	29,451		
2017	119,897		
2018	166,848		
2019	**226,334**		
Total	**1,504,668**		

For a full sales record, with respective volumes, see Appendix I. Below is the list of *unsold stock* for vintages 2014 to 2019 at 31 December 2019.

Table 8: Number of Certificates available for sale.

Vintage	Number of PVCs
2014	18
2016	7,880
2017	2,647
2018	2,075
2019 (current request)	72,882
Total Unsold Stock (PVC)	**85,502**

5. Summary of Monitoring Results

5.1. Introduction

ECOTRUST has continued to monitor participating farmers to establish the progress in attaining the improved land use targets as per the contracts in accordance with the respective technical specifications. The monitoring teams comprise of a combination of farmer coordinators, farmers (trained as local technicians) as well as experts on short-term technical assistance. The monitoring exercises have been conducted in form of home visits to individual farmers in which the number of trees, species planted and hectares of land under improved management is recorded. Trees on farms that were established five or more years ago have had the diameter, crown width and height measured. Performance is assessed by the number of surviving trees for the Year 0, 1 & 3 farmers. The Year 5, 7 & 10 farmers are assessed according to the Diameter at Breast Height for their surviving individual trees.

5.2 General performance of continuing farmers

During 2019, the project was able to reach a total of 3202 farmers (86.5%) out of 3702 farmers that were due for monitoring. Out of the 3202 farmers, 17 farmers were under the Boundary planting system, 210 farmers were under the Dispersed interplanting system and 2975 farmers were under the Woodlot planting system. The Kasese district had the highest representation covering 1819 farmers, with 1620.45 Ha of land under improved management under the Mixed Native spp woodlot technical specification. The majority of farmers not monitored are from the districts of Mitooma (200 farmers), followed by Hoima (85 farmers) and Masindi (62 farmers). The reasons for not monitoring include some farmers declining to receive monitoring teams to their gardens because they knew that they did not have the targets while others sold their land and the new owners needed sensitization before the monitoring. In addition, the project followed up an additional 159 farmers who have been failing to meet their targets over a prolonged period of time.

The project also followed on farmers that may not have been due for monitoring and are presented as Years 2, 6, 8 & 9.

Table 9: Showing farmers due for monitoring for the different districts

District	Monitored	Not Monitored	Total	% Monitored
Bududa	50	4	54	93%
Hoima/Kikuube	198	85	283	70%
Kasese	1819	2	1821	100%
Manafwa	63	23	86	73%
Masindi	375	62	437	86%
Mbale	128	45	173	74%
Mitooma	153	212	365	42%
Namisindwa	14	0	14	100%

Rubirizi	402	6	408	99%
Bulambuli	0	27	27	0%
Sironko	0	34	34	0%
Total	**3202**	**500**	**3702**	**87%**

Table 10: Farmers monitored per technical specifications

Planting system	Number of Farmers	Ha monitored
Boundary	17	11.97
Dispersed	210	102.6
Mixed Native Woodlot	2975	2722.98
Total	**3202**	**2837.55**

Table 11c: showing monitored farmers in the respective years of monitoring

Year of Monitoring	Met Target	Did not Meet Target	Total
0	174	26	200
1	1092	392	1484
2	16	10	26
3	674	320	994
4	11	9	20
5	261	165	426
6	11	0	11
7	3	0	3
8	5	0	5
9	5	0	5
10	14	14	28
Total	**2266**	**936**	**3202**

5.3 Performance per Region

In 2019, an overall total of 72% of the farmers monitored met their desired targets or reduced targets and 28% did not meet their targets. The best performing districts were those in the Mt. Elgon region (Namisindwa, Mbale, Manafwa & Bududa), which produced a success rate of between 80% and 100% of the farmers meeting their targets. Masindi and Kasese followed with 76% & 73% of the farmers meeting their required targets or reduced targets respectively. The least performing district was Mitooma with 39% of the farmers meeting their targets, which was attributed to the slow transition to the new technical specifications. Farmers in this district are already far advanced in the project and thus are reluctant to adjust to new specifications. The highest percentage of the poor performing farmers are in Yr5, which is mainly attributed to some of the trees being below the required Diameter at Breast Height due to differences in age as a result of replacement planting.

Table 12: Showing Individual District performance

District	Met target	Did not meet target	Reduced Target	Total	% met target or reduced target
Mbale	111	17	0	128	87
Bududa	46	4	0	50	92
Manafwa	54	9	0	63	86
Namisindwa	14	0	0	14	100
Hoima/Kikuubes	112	86	0	198	57
Kasese	1303	495	21	1819	73
Masindi	273	91	11	375	76
Mitooma	60	93	0	153	39
Rubirizi	293	107	2	402	73
Total	**2266**	**902**	**34**	**3202**	**72**

5.3.1 Kasese

Kasese continues to have the largest monitoring numbers mainly because it contributes the largest number of farmers in the project. Kasese had 1821 continuing farmers due for monitoring, and all of the farmers (except 2) were reached. Of the 1821 farmers due for monitoring, 1324 (73%) farmers met their targets and therefore qualified for payment. 21 of these farmers only qualified for PES payments after reducing the targets. The farmers in Kasese generally have good and healthy trees with many of them applying the mixed native woodlot planting system.

Table 12.1: Kasese Farmer Monitoring Results

Year of monitoring	Met target	Did not meet target	Reduced target	Total	% met target or reduced target
0	56	5	3	64	92
1	710	195	17	922	79
2	13	10	0	23	57
3	406	203	1	610	67
4	4	8	0	12	33
5	101	70	0	171	59
6	10	3	0	13	77
7	2	1	0	3	67
8	1	0	0	1	100
Total	**1303**	**495**	**21**	**1819**	**73**

Farmers at recruitment stage are usually attracted more by the multiple benefits that 1 Ha of land can return to them given that the people in this area have vast amounts of land to facilitate tree growing. However, after the Year 0 monitoring, these farmers become reluctant to continue implementing the land management practices, making them miss the second supply of seedlings, hence having less trees for the Year 1 monitoring. This has resulted in farmers reducing their targets mainly from 1 Ha of land to 0.5 Ha under improved management. In addition, some of the poor performance has

been as a result of poor spacing while others fail to look after the trees, causing weeds to accumulate and trees to dry. Furthermore, construction of the hydro power line and feeder roads in Kasese also affected some farmers as their trees were destroyed in the process. Other challenges include floods and termites, however the project over the past few years has seen significant reduction in the number of farmers being affected by termites, now affecting only 6 farmers. There have also been rare incidences of malicious damage as well as some farmers selling land to people who are either not interested or not aware on how they can take over the project. Out of the 516 farmers that did not initially meet the targets, 21 farmers had subsequently reduced their targets, while 16 that have consistently failed to meet targets have had their contracts suspended and the corresponding lost carbon replaced.

5.3.2 Rubirizi/Mitooma

Rubirizi had a total of 408 farmers due for monitoring in 2019 and 402 farmers (98.53%) managed to get monitored. Of the monitored farmers, 295 (73.38%) farmers qualified and 107 (26.62 %) did not meet their targets. Mitooma on the other hand had 365 farmers to monitor, of those 153 (41.92%) were monitored. Of the monitored farmers only 39% (60 farmers) managed to meet their monitoring milestones. This is the oldest site and the largest challenge for these pioneer farmers has been the transition from the *Maesopsis eminii* to mixed native technical specifications. The project has suspended contracts from some of these farmers that have consistently struggled with the transition of technical specifications and new farmers have replaced the corresponding lost carbon. The project is, however, continuing to engage with these farmers considering that many of them have attained the age of first harvest (15 years) in accordance with the *Maesopsis eminii* technical specifications. It is also worth noting that 6 of the previously replaced farmers have finally met the targets and their contracts have been re-instated. The rest of the farmers were advised to plant more trees and weed their gardens appropriately. In addition, some farmers have sold their farms and the new farmers have not yet been sensitized to confirm if they would like to continue with the project or not.

Table 12.2: Rubirizi Farmer Monitoring Results

Year of monitoring	Met target	Did not meet target	Reduced target	Total	% Met or reduced targets
0	65	1	0	66	98
1	33	19	2	54	65
2	0	1	0	1	0
3	111	46	0	157	71
4	4	1	0	5	80
5	71	34	0	105	68
6	1	0	0	1	100
7	1	0	0	1	100
8	3	0	0	3	100
9	2	0	0	2	100
10	2	5	0	7	29

Total	**293**	**107**	**2**	**402**	**73**

Table 12.3: Mitooma Farmer Monitoring Results

Year of monitoring	Met target	Did not meet target	Reduced target	Total	% met target
0	2	0	0	2	100
1	3	2	0	5	60
3	12	32	0	44	27
5	33	49	0	82	40
10	10	10	0	20	50
Total	**60**	**93**	**0**	**153**	**39**

5.3.4 Hoima/Kikuube

A total of 198 farmers (70%) were visited out of the 283 farmers that were due for monitoring in Hoima district. 56% (112) farmers met their targets of the monitored farmers. Of the 86 farmers that did not meet target, 60 (74%) were mostly Year 1 farmers from Kiziranfumbi and Kyangwali sub counties. This lower than expected performance is attributed to some farmers changing their land use from tree growing to planting of sugarcane, pine and eucalyptus in their woodlot gardens. The farmers also faced a challenge of termite infestation for the *grevillea* species, which is a matter that the project is continuing to provide support on. The construction of the oil pipeline has continued to affect some other the farmers in the region as they get displaced and hence lose their land. The project has suspended 18 contracts and new farmers have replaced the corresponding lost carbon.

Table 12.4: Hoima/Kikuube Farmer Monitoring Results

Year of monitoring	Met target	Did not meet target	Reduced target	Total	% met target or reduced target
1	62	60	0	122	51
2	2	4	0	6	33
3	28	10	0	38	74
4	2	1	0	3	67
5	15	9	0	24	63
8	1	0	0	1	100
9	1	0	0	1	100
10	1	2	0	3	33
Total	**112**	**86**	**0**	**198**	**57**

5.3.5 Masindi

425 farmers were due for monitoring in Masindi district in 2019. 86% of these (375) were monitored and 284 (76%) farmers managed to meet the required targets. 91 farmers did not meet their targets, many of them being Year 1 and Year 3 farmers. The major reasons for not meeting target in this region was *Maesopsis eminii* and *Grevillea robusta* being

affected by disease and drying events, bushy gardens and termite attacks. The project has suspended 26 farmer contracts and new farmers have replaced the corresponding lost carbon.

Table 12.5: Masindi Farmer Monitoring Results

Year of monitoring	Met target	Did not meet target	Reduced target	Total	% met & reduced targets
0	35	4	4	43	91
1	133	66	5	204	68
3	67	18	1	86	79
5	38	3	1	42	93
Total	**273**	**91**	**11**	**375**	**76**

5.3.6 Mt Elgon region

Mt Elgon region exhibited excellent performance by the continuing farmers with 224 farmers (88.19%) of the monitored farmers meeting their targets. 30 farmers of the monitored farmers in this region did not meet their targets. Farmers in this region did not qualify mainly because of bushy gardens and an insufficient number of trees at the time of monitoring. However, it is possible that the trees existed but were hidden/covered in the bushes.

Table 12.6: Mt. Elgon Farmer Monitoring Results

Year of monitoring	Met target	Did not meet target	Reduced target	Total	% met target
0	8	1	0	9	89
1	164	24	0	188	87
2	1	0	0	1	100
3	48	5	0	53	91
4	1	0	0	1	100
5	3	0	0	3	100
Total	**225**	**30**	**0**	**255**	**88**

5.4. Corrective Actions

While on home visits, monitoring is conducted in the presence of farmers or their representative and the findings are discussed with the farmer. 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 specific to their challenges. In this section, we provide a brief description of the types of corrective actions prescribed.

5.4.1 Improved Silviculture Practices

Many of the farmers that did not qualify were unsuccessful because of poor land management. These farmers have been advised to improve farm management by replanting in the coming season, in addition to practices such as gap filling, weeding and slashing. For those farmers whose gardens were poorly spaced, diseased, had broken tops or crooked stem trees, we also recommended additional pruning and thinning.

5.4.2 Re-activation of Cancelled Contracts

The project continues to engage with all farmers who have ever participated in the project, irrespective of whether their contracts are still active or not. In this reporting period, 22 farmers who had previously exited the program re-joined, bringing back 20.78 Ha under sustainable land management. These contracts have now been re-activated.

Table 13: Showing re-recruited farmers

District	No. of farmers	Area in ha	Total tCO_2	Saleable tCO_2
Hoima	2	2	417.51	463.90
Kasese	13	12.28	2500.14	2777.93
Masindi	1	1	202.59	225.10
Mbale	1	0.5	107.46	119.40
Rubirizi	4	4	847.35	941.50
Mitooma	1	1	202.59	225.10
Total	**22**	**20.78**	**4277.64**	**4752.93**

5.4.3 Reduction in Performance targets

34 farmers with the total allocated area of 35.15 Ha reduced their targets to a new area of 19.2 Ha hence registering a loss of 15.95 Ha (3781.46 Ha). These farmers mostly came from Kasese, Masindi and Rubirizi districts. The reasons for reducing targets is because farmers at recruitment stage are usually attracted more by the potential multiple benefits likely to come from 1 Ha and above. Some farmers, due to consistent failure to meet a specific monitoring stage milestone, decided to reduce target and focus on maintaining the existing trees.

Table 14: Showing farmers with reduced targets

District	No. of farmers	Allocated area/ha	Area lost/Ha	New area/ha	Total tCO_2	Saleable tCO_2	Total tCO_2 lost
Kasese	21	21	10	11	5001.10	4500.99	2381.15
Masindi	11	12.15	4.95	7.2	2829.50	2546.55	1161.51
Rubirizi	2	2	1	1	477.60	429.84	238.80
Total	**34**	**35.15**	**15.95**	**19.2**	**8308.19**	**7477.38**	**3781.46**

5.4.4 Replacement of Lost Carbon

A total of 142.77 Ha producing 29340.6 tCO_2 obtained from 130 farmers have been forwarded for replacements in this reporting period with most replacements coming from

Mitooma, Rubirizi and Masindi. The reason for replacing these farmers is because most of them have sold their plots and the buyer showed no interest in continuing with the project, and hence cut the trees. Some farmers have died prompting family members to cut the trees and in other cases, farmers have changed land use i.e. replacing trees with sugar cane or Eucalyptus.

Table 15: Showing farmers for replacements

District	No. of farmers	Allocated area	Total CO_2	Saleable CO_2
Bududa	2	1.62	386.86	348.17
Bulambuli	1	0.04	9.55	8.60
Hoima	21	19.00	4331.70	3898.53
Kasese	16	15.50	3557.55	3201.80
Manafwa	3	0.32	70.47	63.42
Masindi	26	21.50	5056.11	4550.50
Mitooma	33	43.00	9679.30	8711.37
Rubirizi	28	41.80	9509.19	8558.27
Total	**130**	**142.78**	**32600.72**	**29340.65**

5.6. Monitoring of Impact

5.6.1 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 16.

Table 16: 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	9135
5. Improved land use	Ha under improved management/PV agreements	7644.1

5.6.2 Socio-Economic Impact

In addition to the environmental benefits, the project delivers social and economic benefits. The project measures its impact with regards to 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 17, whereas the governance indicators are presented in Table 18.

Table 17: A summary of Project Socio-economic Impact indicators

Social Dimension	Indicator	Value
1. Livelihoods	Per capita income as a result of PVC sales (USD)	623.72
2. Jobs	Number of employees, hired by the project-Fulltime (men/women)	22
	Number of employees, hired by the project-Part-time (men/women)	90
	Number of Village Savings & Loans Associations supported by TGB	23
	Number of commercial nurseries supported by TGB	24
3. Tenure Security	Number of communal ownership titles	1
	Area covered under communal ownership	245 ha
	Number of communal ownership titles being processed	8 titles
	Area covered under communal ownership in process	1088.42ha

Table 18: A summary of Project Governance Impact indicators

Governance Dimension	Indicator	Value
Social capital	Number of community groups created and/or supported by the Project	87
	Number of community meetings supported by the Project	70
	Number of participants in community meetings supported by the Project	5124
Project governance	ECOTRUST financial audits carried out (internal & external audits)	5
	Number of project meetings with Farmer Groups, & farmer Coordinators	39
	Number of ECOTRUST Board of Trustees meetings	15

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. ECOTRUST has continued to use the mobile money platform to make direct payments to farmers' SACCO or banks accounts or directly to farmers' mobile telephones in the 2019 reporting period. A total of USD **283,803.53** (united states Dollars Two Hundred and Eighty Three Thousand, Eight Hundred and Three and Fifty Two cents) has been distributed to farmers across the districts through various facilities, broken down as USD **237,020.96 as direct transfers** and an additional USD **46,782.57** has been distributed in the form of seedlings.

Tables 19 & 20 below show the 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 19: Summary of payments to producers in 2019

District	Date	Details	Amount paid (UGX)	Amount paid (USD)
Hoima	11/03/2019	Hoima farmer payments monitored in Sept/Oct 2018	38,131,952	10,548.26
	16/04/2019	Hoima farmer payments	31,219,042	8,635.97
	17/04/2019	Hoima farmer payments	3,442,904	952.39
	06/09/2019	Hoima Conituing farmer payments	13,434,348	3,669.58
	09/09/2019	Year 0 farmer payments in Kikube	42,339,902	11,565.12
	17/09/2019	Kikube year 0 farmer payment	322,207	88.01
	01/10/2019	Hoima/Kikube farmer payments	4,670,693	1,275.80
	12/11/2019	Hoima farmer payments	25,766,285	7,038.05
Hoima Total			**159,327,333**	**43,773.18**
Kasese	26/02/2019	Kilembe inter CBO	11,184,978	3,094.05
		Mubuku Intergrated Farmer	84,828,665	23,465.74
	01/04/2019	Bounced funds for Kasese farmers due to wrong account name	23,125,872	6,397.20
	01/12/2019	Kasese farmer payments	264,568,349	72,266.69
Kasese Total			**383,707,864**	**105,223.68**
Masindi	10/01/2019	Masindi farmer payments for sept 2018	65,390,556	17,673.12

	29/01/2019	Masindi 2018 farmer payments	1,293,019	349.46
	01/04/2019	Masindi farmer payment monitored sept 2018	1,705,538	460.96
	16/04/2019	Masindi farmer payments	24,320,002	6,727.52
	30/05/2019	Masindi farmer payment	333,777	90.28
	17/12/2019	Masindi farmer payments	41,330,320	11,289.35
Masindi Total			**134,373,212**	**36,590.70**
Mitooma	18/07/2019	Mitooma farmer payments	70,231,392	19,183.66
Mitooma Total			**70,231,392**	**19,183.66**
Mt.Elgon	02/01/2019	Mbale farmer payment	160,400	43.35
		Mbale farmer payments monitored in July - Aug 2018	9,929,367	2,683.61
	15/01/2019	Mt elgon farmer payments 2018	15,125,599	4,132.68
	30/05/2019	Mbale farmer payments	507,715	138.72
	01/12/2019	Wanale - Mbale TGB farmer payments	28,986,753	7,917.71
	23/12/2019	Mt Elgon farmer payments	38,371,179	10,481.07
Mt. Elgon Total			**93,081,013**	**25,397.14**
Rubirizi	18/07/2019	Rubirizi farmer payments	25,087,341	6,852.59
Rubirizi Total			**25,087,341**	**6,852.59**
Grand Total			**865,808,155**	**237,020.96**

Table 20: Payments to seedlings suppliers in 2019

Date	District	Suppliers Name	Sum of Amount (UGXX)	Sum of Amount (USD)
04/03	Hoima	Abitegeka Wilfred	684,700	186.04
		Agaba Annet	700,750	190.40
		Climate Alart Forest Conservation Trust	757,500	205.82
22/03	Hoima	John Kaheru	32,000	8.70
	Masindi	Hellen Oleru	925,000	251.61
01/04	Kasese	Nyamutale Charles	6,041,500	1,636.20
		Samson Bwambale	1,730,000	468.53
04/04	Rubirizi	Nelson Tugumenawe	3,661,150	990.53
02/07	Kasese	Beneco LTD	7,268,600	1,975.76
18/07	Hoima	Agaba Annet	2,072,350	567.18
		Bwambale Samuel	2,502,500	684.90
		Climate Alart Forest	8,788,500	2,405.30

		ConservationTrust		
	Kasese	Augustine Kiiza Kirera	3,558,450	973.90
	Masindi	Aganyira James	2,394,000	655.21
		Climate Alart Forest Conservation Trust	4,236,750	1,159.54
		Dauda Isingoma	922,250	252.41
		Moses Andama	3,097,500	847.75
		Nyamaizi Fildah	1,561,000	427.23
		Wetaka Gerald	1,984,500	543.13
19/07	Hoima	Burack Tamu	1,312,850	359.00
24/07	Masindi	Livingstone Kabagambe	3,164,000	863.90
12/08	Kasese	Augustine Kiiza Kirera	14,320,000	3,896.57
		Beneco LTD	16,205,000	4,409.49
		Charles Nyamutale	19,040,000	5,180.91
	Rubirizi	Gadson Habasa	1,690,000	459.86
01/12	Hoima	Agaba Annet	528,150	143.89
		Climate Alart Forest Conservation Trust	6,118,250	1,666.92
	Kasese	Augustine Kiiza Kirera	12,865,000	3,505.08
		Charles Nyamutale	16,805,000	4,578.53
		Ruboni Development SACCO LTD	2,982,000	812.45
		Samson Bwambale	8,528,000	2,323.46
05/12	Hoima	Burack Tamu	367,650	100.26
18/12	Hoima	Agaba Annet	5,607,000	1,538.63
	Masindi	Agaba Annet	481,250	132.06
		Aganyira James	5,482,750	1,504.53
		Charles Kisembo	735,000	201.69
		Hellen Oleru	1,361,500	373.61
		Nyamaizi Fildah	1,099,000	301.58
Grand Total			**171,611,400**	**46,782.57**

NB: The USD value is based on the UGX:USD conversion average rate for 2019

7.2 Carbon Community Fund

The Community Carbon Fund (CCF) is a community-based support mechanism established by Trees for Global Benefits in order to address the risk of non-delivery of carbon benefits associated with the project activities. The CCF is a risk-fund and is directly financed by the sales of carbon credits generated by the project. Each participating farmer is required to cede 10% of their carbon revenue to the CCF so that, effectively, the risk of non-delivery is minimized by being spread across several thousands of project participants. Risk is managed through two approaches. In 2019, CCF has been used to replace carbon that has been lost as a result of the 130 farmers that have exited the programme

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.

8.2 Farmer Leaders' Capacity Building

Farmer coordinators also had a series of capacity building meetings in which they were reminded of their roles and responsibilities. Part of the farmer coordinator capacity building aimed at encouraging farmers to conduct their own meetings with the farmers and provide feedback to ECOTRUST on behalf of the farmers. A total of 57 Farmer coordinators were trained (11Kasese, 15 Hoima/Kikuube, 6 in Masindi and 25 in the Mt Elgon Region).

8.3 Farmer-led meetings

Farmer-led meetings have been introduced as a measure of increasing interaction between farmer coordinators and farmers, thus boosting performance as well as providing a feedback mechanism to and from ECOTRUST. These meeting are organized by farmer coordinators at their group level, which are rotated to different villages. The meetings act as a platform for farmers to discuss lessons, benefits, challenges and grievances as they implement the TGB project, as well as ideas that can be developed into fundable projects to benefit the community. In 2019, 29 farmer-led meetings were held (14 in Masindi, 7 Kasese, 6 Rubirizi and 2 in Mitooma). During farmer-led meetings, farmer coordinators meet with farmers to discuss a range of issues such as performance and livelihood opportunities, and endeavor to find solutions to the issues.

8.4. Farmer Sensitization

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. The meetings also help ECOTRUST and farmers to share challenges, lessons as well as feedback especially from monitoring visits and farmer payment.

In total, **70** training meetings were held in 2019 (14 in Mt Elgon region, 14 in Hoima, 15 in Masindi, 20 in Kasese, 1 in Kitagwenda and 6 in Mitooma/Rubirizi districts). Through these, the project reached out to a total number of 5124 people- *4017* males, *1107* females. Subjects discussed in these meetings included, but were not limited to: Climate change/global warming, Plan Vivo cycles, carbon payments, Carbon Community Fund (CCF), climate smart agriculture practices, importance of tree planting, etc. Farmers also discussed the challenges and threats in the community and together proposed possible solutions. The meetings also explore opportunities and lessons learned while participating in this program. This section highlights some of the matters discussed in these meetings.

Table 21: Summary of participants of training meetings per district

District	Sub-county	No. males	No. of females	Total
Bududa	Nakatsi	48	36	84
	Bukibokolo	47	25	72
District subtotal		**95**	**61**	**156**
Mbale	Wanale	40	17	57
	Budwale	58	8	66
District subtotal		**98**	**25**	**123**
Bulambuli	Lusha	84	21	105
	Bulegeni	21	14	34
	Mbigi	8	5	13
District subtotal		**113**	**40**	**152**
Namisindwa	Bumbo	45	11	56
District subtotal		**45**	**11**	**56**
Sironko	Budadiri T.C	28	11	39
	Bugitimwa	111	31	142
District subtotal		**139**	**42**	**181**
Manafwa	Khabutoola	16	3	19
	Bukhadala	27	9	36
	Bubulo	34	16	50
	Bukusu	30	4	34
District subtotal		**107**	**32**	**139**
Hoima sites		1014	144	1158
District subtotal		**1014**	**144**	**1158**
Mitooma	Bitereko	18	22	40
	Kiyanga	33	9	42
District subtotal		**51**	**31**	**82**
Rubirizi	Ryeru	40	20	60
	Katerera	43	6	49
	Kichwamba	29	11	40

	Kyabakara	40	6	46
District subtotal		**152**	**43**	**195**
Kitagwenda	Buhanda	13	3	19
District subtotal		**13**	**3**	**19**
Masindi	Bwijanga	87	16	103
	Budongo	168	26	194
	Pakanyi	119	26	145
	Nyangahya	55	25	80
	Karujubu	51	12	63
	Miirya	112	29	141
District subtotal		**592**	**134**	**726**
Kasese	Kyarumba	338	56	394
	Mbunga	53	67	120
	Rwakingi	15	10	25
	Ruboni	242	40	282
	Nyangonge	122	66	188
	Katooke	59	22	81
	Mukathi	50	34	84
	Kabuyiri	263	72	335
	Kyanjuki	29	25	54
	Buhuhira	36	42	78
	Kinyabwamba	23	17	40
	Maliba	17	12	29
	Rukoki	113	12	125
	Karusandara	29	12	41
	Nduguthu	209	54	263
District subtotal		**1598**	**541**	**2139**
Grand total		**4017**	**1107**	**5124**

8.4 Issues/concerns that came from the meetings:

- There is need to train farmers in basic financial management. SACCOs should inform the farmers about option in managing their finances.
- There is need to introduce other income generating activities in the area. This will reduce on the harvesting immature trees. The communities suggested financial support (buying vanilla cuttings) to start integrating vanilla in their trees. This will also ensure better management of trees after the ten years.

8.5. Feedback Meetings

ECOTRUST held feedback meetings with TGB farmers leaders in Mt Elgon region, and Mitoma district. In Mitooma meetings focused on ensuring that the farmers that are coming to the end of their contract period remain engaged with the project. In Mt. Elgon on the other hand, the discussions focused on strengthening the group recruitment approach, which is a strategy to reduce costs associated with recruiting farmers with micro landholdings.

Table 22: Summary of participants of feedback meetings by district

Venues	Gender		
	Male	Female	Total
Mbale (Mt. Elgon region)	20	3	23
Bulambuli (Mt. Elgon region)	7	2	9
Sub Total	**27**	**5**	**32**
Kiyanga (Mitooma District)	29	13	42
Bitereko (Mitooma District)	13	7	20
Sub Total	**42**	**20**	**62**
Grand total	**69**	**25**	**94**

During the feedback meetings, it was agreed that Farmer coordinators should hold at least one meeting every quarter with the farmers.

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 and the Uganda Biodiversity Fund.

Table 23: Breakdown of operational costs

2018 costs	Total Cost (USD)	Carbon sales (USD)	Other sources (USD)	Providers of other sources
3rd party Verification	11,149.12	9,491.58	1,657.55	IUCN NL
Staff time	319,720.93	251,694.00	68,026.93	IUCN NL, UBF
Farmer capacity building	40,892.72	9,231.19	31,661.53	
Monitoring	56,361.76	42,358.07	14,003.69	
Office running costs	103,667.91	78,564.95	25,102.96	IUCN NL, UBF
Vehicle running costs	28,644.67	16,461.37	12,183.30	
Research & Project Development	37,874.99	793.30	37,081.68	
Coordinators	3,234.01	3,031.45	202.56	IUCN NL
Other travel	20,867.19	10,453.34	10,413.85	
Total	**622,413.3**	**422,079.25**	**200,334.05**	

10. 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	
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	
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	
		1,278,334	

NB. Sales data provided to Plan Vivo for internal reporting only

Sales Related To 2019 Annual Report

Vintage	Buyer	Quantity	Total sale
2016	**Myclimate**	10000	
2016	**ZeroMission P.O. 331**	6,415	
Subtotal		**16415**	
2017	**COTAP**	2644	
2017	**Institute for Sustainable Environment (Clarkson University)**	234	
Subtotal		**2878**	
2018	**ZeroMission P.O. 286 :**	2,000	
2018	**ZeroMission P.O. 289 :**	3,200	
2018	**ZeroMission P.O. 313: ZM Customers**	2,488	
2018	**ZeroMission P.O. 321**	3,151	
2018	**ZeroMission P.O. 344 : Max Norway**	3,005	
2018	**ZeroMission P.O. 347: ZM Customer**	97	
2018	**ZeroMission P.O. 354 : Max Norway**	3,534	
2018	**ZeroMission P.O. 369: ZM Customers**	164	
Subtotal		**17,639**	
2019	**Uganda Carbon Bureau (Jim Turbull)**	11	
2019	**Kampala Food Network**	38	
2019	**Classic Africa**	51	

2019	**ZeroMission P.O. 285**	30,000	
2019	**ZeroMission P.O. 296 : Max Hamburger**	80,628	
2019	**ZeroMission P.O. 342 : Max Hamburger**	76,995	
2019	**ZeroMission P.O. 377: ZM Customers (Äventyrsresor)**	1,679	
Subtotal		189,402	
Total sales in 2019		226,334	

Unsold Stock Up-To and Including 2019 Vintage Credits

Vintage	Quantity of unsold credits
2014	18
2016	7,880
2017	2,647
2018	2,075
2019 (current request)	72,882
Total	**85,502**

Total PVCs after 2019 issuance	**1,590,170**

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

1	Mubuku Intergrated Farmers Association(MIFA)
2	Ruboni Development SACCO Limited
3	Kilembe Inter Community Based Organisation
4	Kilembe United Farmers SACCO
5	Ikongo SACCO
6	Hima SACCO
7	Rutookye Peoples Saving and Credit Society
8	Kyamuhunga Peoples Saving and Credit Society Ltd
9	Bunyaruguru Development SACCO
10	Bitereko Peoples SACCO
11	Kiyanga SACCO
12	Rukoma Financial Services Cooperative
13	Katerera Twetungure SACCO
14	Elgon Farmers SACCO
15	Mbale Epicenter SACCO Ltd
16	Manafwa Teachers SACCO
17	Kyangwali SIDA SACCO
18	Bosoba SACCO
19	Ndangara/Nyakiyanja T Group
20	Busoga SACCO
21	KIKAWECA
22	KAKAMUWECA
23	Kuhure Farmers' Cooperative
24	Kyarumba Banywani Tree Farmers Cooperative Savings

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 Mukina Alfred
21 Nyajura Sarah
22 Tugumenawe Nelson
23 Mwesigye Allen
24 Climate Alert & Forest Conservation Trust

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	172	Ongo Communal Land Association
Alimugonza	73	Alimugonza Communal Land Association
Kayitampisi	57	In process of titling
Sonso	Size in Hectares not established	In process of surveying the forest
Motocayi	53	In process of titling
Bineneza	259.9	In process of titling
Siiba	Size in Hectares not established	In process of surveying the forest
Rwentumba	Size in Hectares not established	In process of surveying the forest
Kyamasuka	65	In process of titling
Tengere	74	In process of titling

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
Kyarumba Banyani Tree Farmers group

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)**