Trees for Global Benefits
2020 Plan Vivo Annual Report

Submitted: March 12th 2021
Approved: April 30th 2021

Organisation:	The Environmental Conservation Trust of Uganda (ECOTRUST)
Contact Person:	Pauline Nantongo Kalunda- Executive Director
Address:	Plot 1034, #85, Lubowa Housing Estate, Entebbe Road, Kampala
	P. O. Box 8986, Kampala, Uganda
Telephone/fax:	+256-31-2266419
Mob:	+256-772-743562
Email:	pnantongo@ecotrust.or.ug
Website:	www.ecotrust.or.ug

SEED Awards 2013 WINNER

Summary

Project overview	
Reporting period	**1st January to 31st December 2020**
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 tCO2/ha equivalent to 163.1 tCO2/Km) - Dispersed Interplanting (carbon potential 170.40 tCO2/ha) - Woodlots (carbon potential 238.80 tCO2/ha) **Mixed Native Spp.** – Ver2 Approved 1st April 2020 This technical specification comprises three different systems: 2 - Boundary Planting (carbon potential 93.09 tCO2/ha equivalent to 232.73 tCO2/Km) - Dispersed Interplanting (carbon potential 196.91 tCO2/ha) - Woodlots (carbon potential 259.91 tCO2/ha)

Project indicators	Historical (2003-2019)	Added/ Issued this period (2020)	**Total**
Number of smallholder households with PES agreements[1]	8996	2802	11798
Number of community groups with PES agreements (where applicable) by Dec 2020	85	1	86
Number of employees, hired by the project- Full-time	22	0	22
Number of employees, hired by the project- Part-time	90	5	95
Number of Village Savings & Loans Associations supported by TGB	23	1	24
Number of commercial nurseries supported by TGB	24	0	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)	7644.06	1597.65	9241.71
Total PES payments to participants (USD)	**$ 3,020,916.35**	**$365,324.46**	**$3,386,240.81**
Average smallholder household income as a result of PVC sales (USD)	n/a		$572.85
Total sum held in trust for future PES payments (USD)	**$2,590,045.06**	$781,969.29	**$3,372,014.35**
Saleable emissions reductions achieved this period (tCO_2)		**385,680.87**	
Adjustments corresponding to previous years (tCO_2)		-25,576	
Total saleable emissions reductions (tCO_2)	**1,590,170**	**360,104.87**	**1,950,274.87**
Allocation to Plan Vivo buffer account (tCO_2)	176,686	40,012	216,698
Unsold Stock at time of submission (PVC)			
Vintage 2014	18	0	18
Vintage 2016	7,880	-5,961	1,919
Vintage 2017	2,647	0	2,647
Vintage 2018	2,075	0	2,075
Vintage 2019	72,882	-50,250	22,632
Vintage 2020 (current request)			257,787
Total Unsold Stock (PVC)			**287,078**
Plan Vivo Certificates (PVCs) issued to date			1,590,170
Plan Vivo Certificates requested for issuance (2020 Vintage)			360,105
Total PVCs issued (including this report)			**1,950,275**

[1] Each PES agreements represents one project participant

Contents

Table of Tables

1. Key Events/Developments and Challenges

Trees for Global Benefits (TGB) is a cooperative carbon offsetting scheme that focuses on the small holder farmer who is linked to the voluntary carbon market through the tree planting initiative based on the Plan Vivo standard. TGB started in 2003, in the Rubirizi and Mitooma districts, and has through the years shown exceptional performance through the different innovations that involve the farmers, recruitment of more communities into the project, and the introduction of new activities alongside 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 2020.

1.1 Key Events

1.1.1 International Engagements

Irrespective of the COVID19 pandemic related ban on international travel, the Trees for Global Benefit has continued to feature during major global conservation discussions, through the virtual presentations and engagements summarized in the table below:

Table 1 International Engagements in Which Trees for Global Benefit Featured

Webinar	Presentation
BIOPAMA Online Event: Payment for Ecosystem Services	Shared experiences of an expert practitioner - as part of the series 'Closing the Gap: Financing and Resourcing of Protected and Conserved Areas October 2020'.
CBA 14 October 2020	Financing Community based adaptation and Ecosystem based adaptation.
Financing Biodiversity in Africa from All Sources 3rd December 2020	Moderated a Panel discussion that included a keynote presentation by Mohamed Bakarr, Senior Environmental Specialist for GEF as well as discussants from UNEP, Green Growth, Africa Development Bank & Government of Uganda.
Annual Stakeholders' Online Webinar *"Business Development for Sustainable Forest Management"* December 2020	Meeting with local, National & International stakeholders to highlight the key achievements for 2020 in mobilizing finances for green and inclusive business development across the different landscapes to enhance conservation, community development and restoration/maintenance of the critical wildlife corridors. Also shared the plans for 2021.
(Climate) finance and local reso`urce mobilization', planned on Friday 13 November	Expert Panelist, sharing the building blocks that TGB has employed to deliver Money Where it Matters as part of the SRJS project Closure webinar week between 9-13 November.

FAO/BMZ Landscape and Territorial days virtual workshop	Reconciling ecological, economic and social objectives in local development – *Experiences from a practitioner, in Making Landscape Restoration an inclusive business, through Blended finance.*
Post 2020 Biodiversity Framework	Chairing the Policy Working Group of the Africa Biodiversity Conservation and facilitating a number of dialogue initiatives, leading to the generation of the Africa Position on the Post 2020 Global Biodiversity Framework.
	Submitted comments on the targets and monitoring indicators for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity as part of the Post 2020 Biodiversity Frameworks.
ACBA Case Study: Biodiversity Conservation Finance	Catalysing Private Sector Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) through Payments for Environmental Services (PES) from Farmer-led Landscape Restoration (FLR): The Case of ECOTRUST's Trees for Global Benefits (TGB) Programme in Uganda, 2003-2019; By Pauline Nantongo Kalunda, Executive Director, ECOTRUST.
Collaborative Study with Tropenbos International: Finance for Integrated Landscape Management	De-Risking Farmer-led Integrated Landscape Management Investments through a Blended Conservation Finance Model : The Case of Trees for Global Benefit (TGB) – an ECOTRUST Programme in Uganda: By Kalunda, P. N et al.

1.1.2 Advocacy for Conservation

The programme has continued to benefit from the Shared Resources and Joint Solutions, a Programme that seeks to ensure the protection of International Public Goods (IPGs). In Uganda, the SRJS programme sought to protect IPGs of food security, water provisioning, climate resilience and biodiversity amidst oil & gas exploration and forest degradation in the Albertine Rift. The five-year programme that came to an end in 2020, was funded by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs through IUCN-NL and WWF NL with lead implementing partners in Uganda being ECOTRUST, AFIEGO and IUCN UCO. Among the achievements of SRJS is the formation of partnerships that led to development of a Catchment Management Plan that seek to improve the management and restoration of the Kiiha Catchment. TGB activities contribute to this catchment management plan, through tree planting, which enhances the ability of catchments to provide watershed services mainly by slowing down water runoff, reducing soil erosion, sedimentation and regulating water flow. Enhancing the natural forest cover binds soil and enhances water purification, soil conservation, stabilization and moisture retention, which helps to reduce flood and landslide risks that threaten local agricultural livelihoods.

In addition, ECOTRUST has under the SRJS, been working with other partners at landscape and national level to save Bugoma Central Forest Reserve and Murchison Falls National Park from destruction as a result of oil and gas as well as hydro power generation developments.

1.1.3 Investment Plan for Northern Albertine Rift Wildlife Corridor

With support from the SRJS Programme, ECOTRUST in consultation with landscape – based partners developed an investment plan for the Northern Albertine Rift seeking to establish a Wildlife Corridor linking Budongo to Bugoma Central Forest Reserves. One of TGB's main objectives is to work with local communities to invest in activities that will assist the recovery of degraded ecosystems, focusing

mainly on community forests as well as compartments within Forest Reserves. The investment plan provides priority areas where TGB activities can be implemented in the Budongo forest systems range in the Northern Albertine Rift.

Figure 1: Community Forests that are part of the connection between Budongo & Bugoma Central Forest Reserves

1.1.4 Mobilising Community into Communal Land Associations

Under SRJS, the Budongo – Bugoma landscape was able to have ten (10) Communal Land Associations (CLAs) registered and documentation submitted to the Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development to be granted titles of communal ownership. This makes the CLAs to be the functional units responsible for managing community forests and can thus enter into carbon offset arrangements. The targeted community forests in the Budongo-Bugoma conservation area include; *Ongo Siiba, Sonso, Tengele, Motocayi, Rwentumba, Kaitampiisi, Kyamasuka, Alimugonza,* and *Bineneza*. In 2020, the Forest Management Plans (FMPs) of all the ten (10) community forests have been revised to include a benefit-sharing plan for the forest resources, the CLAs have been facilitated to develop bankable green business ideas to help improve community livelihoods while restoring the forest health.

In addition, ECOTRUST launched a Gendered Green Investment campaign – where 203 women (in 10 groups) and 913 youths were mobilised to plant 7835 trees on 18.5ha of land provided by schools and religious institutions. This will enable these marginalised groups to participate in the TGB programme.

1.1.5 Project Virtual Tours

As part of the project's adaptation to the shift towards online engagements, the project has designed a number of virtual tours for its different field sites. These virtual tours are available on the ECOTRUST website and are intended to provide stakeholders with an opportunity to visit the programme activities. The virtual tour showcases the different agroforestry systems i.e. *woodlot, dispersed*

interplanting and boundary planting that are currently being practiced by the project participants on smallholder private land. Participants in the virtual tours are able to see the different indigenous tree species and how they are integrated into farm activities to accrue benefits for nature and to the farming household.

1.1.6 Business Development

The farmers in the oldest project site of Mitooma and Rubirizi Districts have been trained and orientated towards the concept of Landscape Restoration as a business. The farmers underwent a capacity building to identify and develop business plans for forest-based enterprises as a strategy for sustainable forest management, even beyond the end of the carbon payments. These Business Plans, will enable TGB farmers producing similar products to access markets as a group. The plan is to support all farmer groups in other TGB landscapes to develop bankable business cases for diversified climate resilient income streams and investments. Each of the four farmer groups in Rubirizi and Mitooma received start-up capital grants grant commitments from CCF as the initial investment in these businesses.

1.1.7 PES as Social Security Transfers

The COVID19 pandemic presented TGB with a challenge of demonstrating its contribution in building of resilience of participating communities to natural disasters. The national travel lockdown and other travel restrictions as well as the resultant slowdown in economic activity, further marginalised the rural poor communities targeted by the community. While the environment was good for food production in most of the sites, there was very limited access to markets. Farmers were not able to translate their hard-earned produce into cash. In some of the communities, therefore, the PES transfers, which are the performance – based incentives for adoption of sustainable practices resulting into the mitigation of climate change – were the only social safety nets to enable these communities to survive the trying times. A total of $365,324.46 has been transferred to communities either directly to the farmers or community nursery operators in this reporting period. For the ease of distributing funds to the project beneficiaries, each carbon farmer joins a local village bank through the purchase of shares. The carbon revenue derived by the sales of PVCs is then used to capitalise the village bank and the regular payments help provide funds for loans already disbursed to its members who are also project participants. At the end of every year, each member receives dividends and, most importantly to the farmers, the carbon sale agreement can be used as collateral to acquire new loans. Subsequent carbon payments are then used to pay down these loans.

1.1.8 Staff Developments

As the programme expands and diversifies, the Board of ECOTRUST has created a position of Risk and Compliance to ensure that there is minimum exposure of risk to the programme and the organisation in general. The officer is responsible for ensuring that international best practices are adhered to throughout the organisation's operations. This is intended to improve quality assurance, by putting in place systems that will continually detect changes in the programme, and generate data that would support decision making for the programme in a timely manner.

1.1.9 Kua, a coffee Start-up, Supports Provision of Watershed Services

With support from Kua, a Coffee Start-up based in Australia, Trees for Global Benefit has engaged in supporting smallholder coffee farmers in Mount Elgon to adopt **watershed management systems**. The support from Kua compliments the PES facility initiative, established in 2015 under TGB with support from UNDP, where the Plan Vivos are also used to estimate the Environmental Services leading to protection of catchment areas through integrated soil and water conservation. Kua's support is dedicated to farmers that undertake activities such as planting trees, digging contour trenches and planting Napier grass for slope stabilisation to mitigate landslide risk. Kua intends to meaningfully contribute to the goal of building the sustainability of its supply chain through support of the Trees for Global Benefit Program; sequestering carbon, providing farmers with an alternative source of income and enabling practices such as agro-forestry, integrated soil and water conservation, land contouring and terracing and afforestation. The support provided in 2020 will benefit a total of 135 farmers implementing soil and water conservation activities on at least 26ha with 10,000metres of Napier grass along contours & terraces in Mt. Elgon.

1.2 Key Challenges

1.2.1 COVID 19 Pandemic Related Restrictions

The COVID 19-related country response, including travel restrictions and social distancing, has been a major challenge to TGB's community engagement strategies. The project normally holds workshops to support new applicants' understanding of the project requirements and to identify forestry activities that are suitable to their needs. In addition, the project holds feedback meetings with the communities to identify areas of improvement in the management of the project. With almost half a year under a total lockdown, followed by limited movement and social distancing requirements, limitted meetings were carried out throughout the year in most project sites. As soon as the lockdown was imposed, management invested in developing and implementing a business continuity plan, which mainly revolved around remote engagements. The project relied heavily on telecommunication with the farmer leadership and community – based service providers, particularly nursery operators. ECOTRUST was able to establish standard operating procedures at every community tree nursery to enable the farmers to access seedlings with minimal COVID19 transmission risk. ECOTRUST also strengthened Internet Connectivity and On-line Conferencing to enable communication and the exchange of ideas between the different project coordinators at the different project sites. With these measures in place, the project has been able to use its existing social infrastructure of farmer leaders, community nursery operators and community technicians to recruit and support farmers to implement project activities. The project monitoring activities were, however, fully executed since the home visits do not involve many people and they are right on the farms. In spite of the travel and social distance-related challenges, the project still managed to recruit a record number of farmers (**2,907** farmers compared to 2,130 recruited in 2019) and hectares **(1,703.65Ha compared to 1,274.63ha recruited in 2019)** since its inception. This was largely due to investment done in previous years to expand into the new districts of Kitagwenda and Kikuube. The project was also able to support four (4) farmer groups in Rubirizi & Mitooma Districts to develop Business Plans expected to benefit at least 880 farmers whose woodlots are above ten (10) years. The Business Plans were awarded grants worth UGx 80 million from the Carbon Community Fund.

1.2.2 Poor Weed control

Following, an initiative by the Agriculture Cluster Development Project under the Ministry of Agriculture, in which the uptake of pesticides and fertilisers was being promoted, some farmers in Hoima applied herbicides in a non-descriminatory manner, which ended up killing most their trees. Normally, TGB farmers are able to grow the trees without any synthetic pesticide or herbicide.

1.2.3 Floods and Landslides in Kasese

During the month of April and May 2020, farmers in the Kasese area experienced landslides and floods as a result of heavy rains in the Mt. Rwenzori region, which were categorized by the Meteorological Authority to be beyond normal. These flash floods affected 276 farmers in the sub counties of Maliba, Karusandara, Bugoye, Kilembe, Kyarumba and Kisinga in the Kasese district. The floods and landslides washed away food crops and trees, rendering the affected farmers vulnerable to the effects of the floods and landslides. The sub-counties most affected are Karusandara, Maliba, Buhuhira and Kilembe. Unfortunately, the floods and landslides took place in the midst of the COVID19 lockdown, putting additional challenges on an already stressed community. Households were displaced, entire gardens as well as school and hospital buildings were swept away, resulting into food insecurity, water borne diseases etc. Some of the affected farmers lost their gardens, while others continued to plant and replace the lost trees.

The project responded by providing some relief items to the displaced farmers including food and solvatten jerricans, which are solar water purifiers. The Solvatten Jerricans were provided by a sponsor through ECOTRUST, while the rest of the relief items were made possible by the Community Carbon Fund (CCF), which serves as a self – managed risk fund to support farmers that have been disproportionately affected by extreme events.

Figure 2: Floods in Kasese District, after four (4) of the major rivers in the area overflowed twice in a period of 3 days

1.2.4 Farmer death

The project has lost a total of 41 farmers in this reporting year, the majority of whom (26 farmers) were from Kasese. The main cause of death has been recorded as illness associated with old age. Although farmers of advanced age join the project with an objective of adding value on the land they hope to bequeath to their children, not all the deceased farmers' families continue with the project. In addition, one of the pioneer farmers in Kyangwali sub county, Kikuube district, Bwambale Samuel passed on. The late farmer also has been managing a tree nursery that has been a seedling source to many of the farmers in the area.

2. Activities, Total project size and participation

2.1 Current Technical Specifications

The project has continued to apply the revised version of the Mixed Native Spp Technical specifications, in boundary, woodlot and intercropping systems. All the farmers recruited in 2020, were recruited under the Mixed Native Spp technical specifications in woodlot planting, dispersed interplanting and boundary planting. Farmers apply the technical specifications that are suitable for their own needs, depending on how much land is available for tree planting. Most of the participating households have applied the woodlot system, followed by dispersed interplanting. Boundary planting is mainly applied in the Mt. Elgon Landscape, where the landholdings are extremely small. During the reporting period, only 4 farmers from Namisindwa District in Mt. Elgon adopted the boundary planting system. Dispersed interplanting on the other hand was adopted by 793 farmers, while the woodlot system was adopted by a total of 2111 farmers.

The project has continued to support farmers, in the regions where the *Maesopsis eminii* technical specification had been the main system, to adopt the new technical specifications without necessarily changing the contract terms. All gap filling by the continuing farmers has continued to be guided by the Mixed Native spp. technical Specifications.

2.2 Submission for the Plan Vivo Certificate issuance

During the reporting period, a total of **3,238** farmers in the various project operating districts applied, were given a go ahead to plant and were monitored. Of those that were monitored farmers, **2,908 farmers (90%) qualified** and were recruited into the programme bringing a total of **1,703.65Ha of farmland** under improved management using the Mixed Native Spp. Technical specification. This was approximately a **50%** increment from 2019 that brought 2,130 farmers with 1,274.63 Ha of land under improved management. Most of the farmers recruited in 2020 were recruited in Kasese district (1131 farmers) accounting for 39% of the total number of farmers recruited. Kasese was followed by Kitagwenda and Kikuube, with 269 and 248 farmers respectively. Both Kitagwenda and Kikuube are relatively new districts and have sufficient amount of fertile land available for tree planting. In addition, the willingness of the community members to participate in conservation activities, has been motivated by testimonies of participating farmers from the neighbouring districts. The Kikuube District was formerly part of Hoima district and expansion here is largely due to support from the Uganda Biodiversity Fund, which supported the inclusion of farmers planting trees in Central Forest Reserves.

Table 2 Summary Recruitment per Technical Specification per District

Sub-county	No. of Farmers	Ha to be planted	Total tCO2	Saleable tCO2
Boundary				
Namisindwa				
Bukiabi	1	0.2	18.616	16.7544
Bukokho	2	1.8	167.544	150.7896
Bumbo	1	0.4	37.232	33.5088
	4	**2.4**	**223.392**	**201.0528**
Boundary	**4**	**2.4**	**223.392**	**201.0528**
Dispersed				
Bududa				
Bukibokolo	32	11	2166.01	1949.409
Nakatsi	18	6.93	1364.5863	1228.12767
	50	**17.93**	**3530.5963**	**3177.53667**
Bulambuli				
Bulegeni	22	4.05	797.4855	717.73695
Lusha	29	5.51	1084.9741	976.47669
	51	**9.56**	**1882.4596**	**1694.21364**
Hoima				
Buseruka	1	1	196.91	177.219
Kitoba	2	1.75	344.5925	310.13325
	3	**2.75**	**541.5025**	**487.35225**
kikuube				
Bugambe	3	4	787.64	708.876
kiziranfumbi	5	8.5	1673.735	1506.3615
	8	**12.5**	**2461.375**	**2215.2375**
Manafwa				
Manafwa TC	30	12.6	2481.066	2232.9594
	30	**12.6**	**2481.066**	**2232.9594**
Mbale				
Budwale	114	34.98	6887.9118	6199.12062
Wanale	338	68.065	13402.67915	12062.41124
	452	**103.045**	**20290.59095**	**18261.53186**
Namisindwa				
Bukiabi	8	6	1181.46	1063.314
Bukokho	52	23.9	4706.149	4235.5341
Bumbo	57	15.74	3099.3634	2789.42706
	117	**45.64**	**8986.9724**	**8088.27516**
Sironko				
Budadiri T.C	19	4.62	909.7242	818.75178
Bugitimwa	63	11.35	2234.9285	2011.43565
	82	**15.97**	**3144.6527**	**2830.18743**
Dispersed Planting	**793**	**219.995**	**43319.21545**	**38987.29391**
Woodlot				
Hoima				

Buseruka	1	1	260	234
kigorobya	26	22.45	5,835	5,251
Kitoba	39	38.2	9,929	8,936
kiziranfumbi	1	0.5	130	117
	67	**62.15**	**16,153**	**14,538**
Kasese				
Bugoye	18	11.15	2,898	2,608
Bulembia Division	38	19	4,938	4,444
Kahokya	57	32	8,317	7,485
Kilembe	13	6.5	1,689	1,520
Kisinga	106	53.4	13,879	12,491
Kitabu	2	1	260	234
Kyabarungira	188	95.3	24,769	22,292
Kyarumba	83	41.5	10,786	9,708
kyondo	221	110.7	28,772	25,895
Mahango	2	1	260	234
Maliba	177	88.1	22,898	20,608
Mbunga	10	5	1,300	1,170
Muhokya	19	9.5	2,469	2,222
Nyakabingo	2	1	260	234
Rukoki	195	97.5	25,341	22,807
	1131	**572.65**	**148,837**	**133,954**
kikuube				
Bugambe	26	24	6,238	5,614
kabwoya	74	70.4	18,298	16,468
kiziranfumbi	37	29.15	7,576	6,819
Kyangwali	103	93.5	24,302	21,871
	240	**217.05**	**56,413**	**50,772**
Kitagwenda				
Buhanda	192	191.9	49876.729	44889.0561

Kabujogera	1	1	260	234
Kicheche	13	13	3,379	3,041
Mahyoro	24	24	6,238	5,614
Ntara	27	27	7,018	6,316
Ruhunga	12	12	3,119	2,807
	269	**268.9**	**69889.799**	**62900.8191**
Manafwa				
Manafwa TC	1	0.2	52	47
	1	**0.2**	**52**	**47**
Masindi				
Bwijanga	23	20.5	5,328	4,795
Miirya	40	23.7	6,160	5,544
Nyangahya	24	21.2	5,510	4,959
Pakanyi	65	49.1	12,762	11,485
Budongo	11	6.5	1,689	1,520
	163	**121**	**31,449**	**28,304**
Mbale				
Wanale	7	0.92	239	215
Budwale	1	0.2	52	47
	8	**1.12**	**291**	**262**
Namisindwa				
Bumbo	2	0.3	78	70
Bukiabi	2	1.64	426	384
	4	**1.94**	**504**	**454**
Rubirizi				
Katerera	34	36	9,357	8,421
Kichwamba	25	26.6	6,914	6,222
Kirugu	1	1	260	234
Kyabakara	56	62	16,114	14,503
Rubirizi Towncouncil	1	1	260	234
Katanda	109	109	28,330	25,497

	226	**235.6**	**61,235**	**55,111**
Sironko				
Budadiri T.C	1	0.6	156	140
Bugitimwa	1	0.04	10	9
	2	**0.64**	**166**	**150**
Woodlot planting	**2111**	**1481.25**	**384,992**	**346,493**
Grand Total	**2908**	**1703.645**	**428534.295**	**385680.8655**

Table 3 Summary of issuance per technical specification

Planting System	No. of Farmers	Ha to be planted	total tCO_2	saleable tCO_2
Mixed Native Spp Woodlot	2,111	1,481	384,992	346,493
Mixed Native Spp Dispersed Interplanting	793	220	43,319	38,987
Boundary Planting	4	2	223	201
	2,908	**1,704**	**428,534**	**385,681**

Table 4 Summary of Plan Vivo Certificate (PVC) issuance request

Qualified total tCO2	428,534
Total saleable tCO_2	385,681
Set aside for buffer allocation & replacements	42,853
Prior year adjustments	25,576
Saleable tCO2 available for issuance (90%)	360,105
Net contribution to buffer account this period	40,012

3. Sale of Plan Vivo Certificates

During the annual reporting period (2020), the project has sold tCO2 158,629 (down from 226,334 tCO2 in 2019) to various buyers, as indicated in Table 5 below. This includes 102,418 tCO2 from new issuances (vintage 2020), and 55,961 tCO2 from existing vintages of stock.

Table 5 Sales for the reporting period January to December 2020

Vintage	Name of purchaser/source of funds	Number of PVCs purchased	Price per certificate (USD)*	Total amount received (USD)*
2016	COTAP	5801		
2016	Kaffeekoop GmbH	160		
Subtotal		**5,961**		
2019	C Level	250		
2019	Myclimate	50,000		
Subtotal		**50,250**		
2020	ZeroMission Max	45,000		
2020	ZeroMission	319		
2020	ZeroMission	1740		
2020	ZeroMission	50,000		
2020	ZeroMission	3,429		
2020	ZeroMission	726		
2020	ZeroMission	1,017		
2020	Uganda Carbon Bureau (Jim Turnbull)	11		
2020	Uganda Carbon Bureau (Abi)	176		
Subtotal		**102,418**		
Grand Total		**158,629**		

*Information for internal reporting only

Table 6 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		
2020	**158,629**		

Total	**1,663,047**		

*Information for internal reporting only

For a full sales record, with respective volumes, see Appendix I. Below is the list of *unsold stock* for vintages 2014 to 2020 at 31 December 2020.

Table 7 Total Number of Certificates available for sale

Vintage	Quantity of unsold credits
2014	18
2016	1,919
2017	2,647
2018	2,075
2019	22,632
2020 (current request)	257,787
Total Unsold Stock (PVC)	**287,078**

4. Summary of Monitoring Results

4.1 Introduction

ECOTRUST has continued to monitor farmers to establish the progress in attaining the improved land use targets as per the contracts in accordance with their respective technical specifications. The monitoring teams comprise of a combination of farmer coordinators, farmers (trained as local technicians) as well as experts (full time and part time staff) to participate in the tree/farm monitoring exercises in the individual districts. The monitoring exercises are conducted in the form of home visits to the farmer gardens in which number of trees, tree dimensions and species planted are recorded, depending on the age of the trees planted. Performance for trees that are three years and below is assessed by the number of surviving trees, while that of trees that are five years and above – to fifteen years, is assessed by measuring the Diameter at Breast height for the surviving individual trees.

Most of the monitoring for 2020 was conducted using a mobile application that was designed in 2019 as one of the measures for making sure the monitoring exercises are conducted in a more cost effective and timely manner, also resulting in timely farmer payments. The monitors reported a reduction in time spent on the farmer gardens for the monitoring exercises hence an improvement in efficiency of the monitoring practice. In addition, all old farmer data including the farmer bio-data, farm locations, years of planting, performance of the farmers in the respective years, payments made to the farmers has been digitized and is ready for importation into the system.

4.2 General performance of the continuing farmers

During the reporting period, the project was able to reach a total of **5,008** farmers in all the TGB landscapes. Out of these, 204 farmers were not due for regular monitoring but are currently under support to migrate to the new technical specifications. These were farmers that had been recruited under the ***Maesopsis eminii*** Technical specification and the home visits were follow-up visits (see 2.5). Of the **4,804** other farmers that were visited, **3,820 (80%)** farmers qualified for payment as they had met their targets for the respective monitoring years, leaving 984 farmers that did not meet their targets. These farmers did not meet their targets due to the following reasons;

- **Poor maintenance** such as poor spacing of trees, no weeding etc., delayed planting or simply neglecting the seedlings;
- **Floods** that washed away some of the new trees especially in Kasese district;
- **Pests** e.g. termites attacking mainly Grevillea as well as some trees being damaged by animals such as baboons and elephants; or,
- **Land Transfer** either due to the unfortunate demise of the lead Farmer and family members cutting down the trees or selling of the land to a new owner who is not interested in the project.

Overall, 80% of the monitored farmers met their monitoring targets with more than half of the districts achieving 80% and above and an additional 27% achieving a success rate of >75%. Kasese district had the highest number of farmers monitored – 2,690 farmers with all of them under the Mixed Native Spp. Woodlot technical specification. The poorest performing district continues to be Mitooma district, where farmers are

struggling to migrate to the new technical specifications. This is mainly because by the time the most appropriate technical specifications were developed, these farmers had already gone too far into the rotation period. In addition, many of these farmers have reached harvesting age according to the ***Maesopsis eminii*** Technical specification. The main challenge is that some farmers have sold their land to new owners that are not familiar with the expected harvesting plan. Some are the original owners but are still not sticking to the harvesting plan.

Table 8 showing farmers monitored per district.

District	**Qualified**	**Not Qualified**	**Total**	**%age Qualified**
Bududa	86	15	101	85%
Bulambuli	39	5	44	89%
Hoima	245	80	325	75%
Kasese	2152	538	2690	80%
Kikuube	69	13	82	84%
Kitagwenda	30		30	100%
Manafwa	39	21	60	65%
Masindi	377	140	517	73%
Mbale	291	38	329	88%
Mitooma	127	69	196	65%
Namisindwa	31	7	38	82%
Rubirizi	313	51	364	86%
Sironko	21	7	28	75%
Total	**3820**	**984**	**4804**	**80%**

Table 9 Farmers monitored per technical specifications.

Planting System	**Qualified**	**Not Qualified**	**Total**
Boundary planting	42	5	**47**
Dispersed inter-planting	467	84	**551**
Woodlot planting	3311	895	**4206**

Table 10 showing monitored farmers in 2020 by their respective years of monitoring.

Year of monitoring	**Qualified**	**Not Qualified**	**Total**	**%age Qualified**
0	32	13	**45**	71%
1	1898	461	**2359**	80%
3	1148	264	**1412**	81%
5	568	172	**740**	77%
7	22	1	**23**	96%
10	152	73	**225**	68%

4.3 Kasese

Kasese district has the biggest number of farmers monitored because it holds the greatest number of farmers for the project. Of the monitored farmers, Kasese had 2,152 (80%) farmers meeting their targets therefore qualifying for payment. The farmers generally have good gardens with healthy trees under the Mixed Native Woodlot planting system.

Table 11 showing performance of monitored farmers in Kasese District.

Year of monitoring	Qualified	Not Qualified
0	1	3
1	1075	250
3	791	213
5	280	71
10	5	1
Total	2152	538

Farmers in Kasese have faced drought, landslides and flooding challenges this year that has led to the trees being destroyed. Some of the year 3 & 5 farmers have started thinning and selling the thinnings as firewood, mainly for brick burning. The readily market for firewood poses a challenge to the project. A few farmers in Kasese district have planted eucalyptus along with the indigenous trees, which although useful in meeting the fuelwood demand, affects the performance of the indigenous trees. Farmers have generally managed the termites that have continually affected the *grevillea robusta* in the region by applying local remedies e.g., a mixture of ash and urine which they spray on the anthill and this seems to be working.

4.4 Rubirizi/Mitooma

Rubirizi and Mitooma are TGB's pioneer CPA and constitute of farmers recruited using the ***Maesopsis eminii***, as well as the Mixed native Spp Technical specifications. A total of 560 farmers were monitored in the two districts and 65% (127) of the monitored farmers in Mitooma and 86% (313) farmers monitored in Rubirizi met expected performance targets.

Table 12 showing performance of monitored farmers in Mitooma and Rubirizi Districts.

Mitooma		
Year of monitoring	**Qualified**	**Not Qualified**
1	1	0
3	1	0
5	48	8
10	77	61
Total	**127**	**69**
Rubirizi		
Year of monitoring	**Qualified**	**Not Qualified**
1	54	6
3	98	2
5	101	34

10	60	9
Total	**313**	**51**

The majority of farmers that did not qualify for payment are classified as part of the group that is supposed to be transitioning from Measopsis eminii to Mixed Native Species. Many of these farmers would ordinarily by now be coming to the end of their rotation cycle, yet some of the trees are still too young due to the transition. The monitoring results therefore do not generate the DBH that is expected at this stage, simply because most of the trees were young. In addition, Mitooma faces a challenge of problem animals such as the baboons that eat up some of the young trees that had been replanted, which causes the farmers to not qualify for payment. The project will continue to engage with the farmers, empowering them with opportunities for generating income from the trees without cutting them before they mature. The programme has already started with capacity building to identify and develop business cases as well as the awarding of grants worth USD5,500 to each group as initial investment in the group businesses.

4.5 Hoima/Kikuube

Hoima District has recently been subdivided into two districts – Hoima and Kikuube. TGB has continued to manage farmers in this area as part of on CPA. A total of 407 farmers were monitored and 314 (77%) of the monitored farmers met their targets while 23% of the farmers did not meet their targets. The farmers that did not meet targets were maintaining the trees poorly and some had converted some of the land to sugarcane. Farmers in this region have continued to sell their land to investors that come in due to the construction of the oil pipeline hence cutting down their trees. ECOTRUST has, under the Shared Resources, Joint Solutions programme, been engaged in a series of advocacy initiatives, with the players in the sugarcane as well as the oil and gas sector, to minimise their footprint in the area.

Table 13 showing performance of monitored farmers in Hoima and Kikuube Districts.

Hoima		
Year of monitoring	**Qualified**	**Not Qualified**
0	8	2
1	95	32
3	81	15
5	51	29
7	1	0
10	9	2
Total	**245**	**80**
Kikuube		
Year of monitoring	**Qualified**	**Not Qualified**
0	2	1
1	66	12
5	1	0
Total	**69**	**13**

4.6 Masindi

A total of 517 farmers were monitored in 2020 in Masindi district and 73% (377) of these farmers met their monitoring target while 140 did not meet their target. More than half (57.8%) of the farmers that did not meet their targets were in Year 1 farmers and most of these farms were not well maintained with bushy gardens and trees that are not pruned. The Year 5 farmers in this region have not met targets mainly because they are abandoning the trees. The farmers that have cut down trees have been encouraged to plant more trees and were advised to improve on the management of weeds in the respective gardens.

Table 14 showing performance of monitored farmers in Masindi District.

Year of monitoring	Qualified	Not Qualified
0	5	6
1	214	81
3	104	28
5	53	25
10	1	0
Total	**377**	**140**

4.7 Mt Elgon region

Mt Elgon region displayed good performance in this monitoring period with 84.97% (520 out of 612) continuing farmers meeting their targets and 15.5% of the farmers not meeting their targets. The farmers in this region have very small landholdings with manageable tree planting targets. This region in 2019 had an increase in recruitment due to the increased interest in the project from the community members after realising the benefits of conservation. Many of these farmers accessed free seedlings during the recruitment period and attended the induction meetings, which contributed the success among the Year 1 farmers. The farmers that did not meet their targets were advised to cut down the bushes and also do some gap filling for those that had insufficient number of trees and poor spacing.

Table 15 showing performance of monitored farmers in the Districts of Mt. Elgon.

District	Monitoring year 0		Monitoring year 1		Montioring year 3		Monitoring year 5		Monitoring year 7	
	Qualified	Not Qualified	Qualified	Not Qualified	Qualified	Not Qualified	Qualified	Not Qualified	Qualified	Not Qualified
Bududa	1	0	51	11	8	2	13	2	13	0
BULAMBULI	0	0	18	5	21	0	0	0	0	0
Manafwa	2	0	29	20	7	1	1	0	0	0
Mbale	12	1	223	32	28	1	20	3	8	1
Namisindwa	0	0	31	7	0	0	0	0	13	0
Sironko	1	0	11	6	9	0	0	0	0	0
Total	**16**	**1**	**363**	**81**	**73**	**4**	**34**	**5**	**34**	**1**
Total Qualified	**520**									

Total Not Qualified	**92**

4.8 Corrective Actions

During the home visits, counting of trees and measuring of tree attributes is done for each farmer, with the farmer, at their respective gardens to ensure accuracy and consistency of results. The farmers and the monitors discuss the results, and agree on the corrective actions that will enable the farmers to meet their targets. These actions are recorded and followed up on during the subsequent monitoring periods. This interaction offers practical extension services to the farmers by the project to help achieve the expected land management milestones at the different stages of the woodlot. In addition, the project coordinator (ECOTRUST) uses the information from the monitoring reports to improve the execution of the project. In this section, we summarise the corrective actions that the farmers were expected to implement in order to improve performance.

4.8.1 Replanting of lost trees

Farmers that failed to meet targets because the trees were lost due to drought and floods were advised to replant in the next rains/seasons to replace the lost trees. The farmers that had insufficient number of trees, especially the Year 1, 3 and 5 farmers, were advised to do some gap filling in their gardens. These trees would be especially monitored by the farmer coordinators to make sure they are growing healthily.

4.8.2 Improving management

Many of the poorly performing farmers failed to meet targets due to poor management, often leaving the trees in bushes, and/or not attending to the pests and diseases on time. In some cases, the seedlings had been planted too close to each other, or for some reason, the tops of the trees had broken off and in others the stems were crooked. These were advised to learn from fellow farmers on the proper maintenance of the gardens that includes weeding, slashing, pruning, and thinning to prevent bushy gardens, pests and diseases. The farmers were also advised to be vigilant for the problem animals like the baboons that destroy their trees especially at Year 1 and eventually make them not meet their targets. The project has initiated the process of identifying model farms and converting them into farmer field schools to facilitate peer learning.

4.8.3 Adjustments in Targets

4.8.3.1 Reducing target

During the discussion of results with some of the farmers, it becomes clear that they may not have been realistic at the time of application and thus set targets that are beyond their reach. There has been some target reduction among the farmers because some of the land they apply to put under improved management becomes too ambitious for them to manage. Mostly the farmers apply for one (1) hectare of land which is eventually reduced to at least 0.5Ha under improved management.

4.8.3.2 Replacements

The project has recruited new farmers to replace the farms whose entire gardens were washed away by the floods or have sold land to disinterested new owners or have cut the trees. A total of 106 farmers representing 123.7 Ha of land and contributing 28,415.3tCO_2 have been forwarded for replacement in this reporting period. Most of them are Year 10 farmers from Kasese and Mitooma that have cut down their trees and sold their land. Some of the farmers have passed on, causing the family members to cut down the trees. Some of the farmers are Year 3 and 5 farmers that have changed their land use to planting of Eucalyptus trees.

Table 16 showing farmers for replacement.

District	**Number of farmers**	**Allocated area (ha)**	**TOTAL CO_2**	**SALEABLE CO_2**
Bududa	1	0.15	35.82	32.24
Bulambuli	1	0.13	8.48	7.63
Hoima	4	3.63	851.95	766.76
Kasese	49	51.00	12178.80	10960.92
Manafwa	3	0.91	155.11	139.60
Mbale	5	2.42	436.83	393.15
Mitooma	42	64.50	14523.25	13073.23
Rubirizi	1	1.00	225.10	202.59
Total	**106**	**123.74**	**28,415.34**	**25,576.11**

4.8.3.3 Transition to New Technical Specifications

Some of the farmers (*98 farmers with 131.9Ha*) in the old project sites of Mitooma, Hoima and Kasese are still being supported to migrate to the new technical specifications. These are mostly year 10 farmers from Mitooma, Hoima and Kasese who have been in the process of transitioning from the old technical specifications. The main challenge is that the replanted trees have not achieved the DBH that is expected for year 10. Some of the farmers have a few well managed trees on their plots of land, hence they will be followed up to make sure that as many trees as possible are maintained on the farms.

Table 17 showing farmers for follow-up.

District	**Number of farmers**	**Number of hectares**
Hoima	5	4.375
Kasese	6	7.5
Masindi	5	4.7
Mbale	1	0.39
Mitooma	70	101.15
Rubirizi	11	13.775
Total	**98**	**131.89**

4.9 Monitoring of impact

The project has continuously built the capacity of households, communities and their natural capital to prevent, mitigate or cope with risk and recover from climate induced shocks which measures include tree planting. The project has, in 2020, mobilised **399,986.44tCO2** in net emission reductions**,** contributing to climate change mitigation.

4.9.1 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. A summary of the project's current contribution to selected environmental co-benefits is presented below:

Table 18 summary of Project Environmental Indicators

Environmental Dimension	Indicator	Value
1. Biodiversity conservation	% of indigenous tree species planted (as opposed to naturalized species)	79%
2. Protected areas conservation	No. of protected areas covered by project	9
3. Catchment condition	List of catchments improved by the programme	7
4. Climate resilience	No. of households with improved adaptation strategies	11798
5. Improved Land Use	Ha under improved management / PV agreements	9241.705

4.9.2 Socio-economic impact

In addition to the environmental benefits above, the project also delivers social and economic benefits to the farmers and the communities they are living in. 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. A summary of the project's contribution to selected socio-economic benefits is presented below:

Table 19 summary of Project socio-economic impact indicators

Social Dimension	Indicator	Value
1. Livelihoods	· Per capita income as a result of PVC sales	572.85
2. Jobs	· Number of employees, hired by the project-Fulltime (men/women)	22 (9 MALE & 13 FEMALE)
	· Number of employees, hired by the project-Part-time (men/women)	• 9 (4 FEMALE & 5 MALE) at the various offices, • 10 (1 FEMALE & 9 MALE) part time monitors • 76 (5 FEMALE & 71 MALE) Farmer coordinators
	· Number of Village Savings & Loans Associations supported by TGB	24

	· Number of commercial nurseries supported by TGB	24
3. Tenure Security	· Number of communal ownership titles	1
	· Area covered under communal ownership (ha)	754
	· Number of communal ownership titles being processed	9
	· Area covered under communal ownership in process	1,540 ha (Siiba, Sonso and Rwentumba ha TBD)

Table 20 summary of Project governance impact indicators

Governance Dimension	**Indicator**	**Value**
Social capital	· Number of community groups created and/or supported by the Project	86
	. Number of Households in these community groups with PES agreements (each PES agreement corresponds to one participant)	11798
	· Number of community meetings supported by the Project	72
	· Number of participants in community meetings supported by the Project	7,500

5. PES Update

5.1. 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 2020 reporting period. A total of USD 365,324.46 (united states Dollars Three Hundred and Sixty-Five Thousand, Three Hundred and Twenty - Four and Forty - six cents) has been distributed to farmers across the districts through various facilities, broken down as USD **315,701.25** as direct transfers and an additional USD **49,623.21** has been distributed in the form of seedlings.

Table 21: Summary of payments to producers in 2020

District	Date	Memo	Sum of Amount (UGX)	Sum of Amount (USD)
Hoima	**23-Dec**	Hoima farmer payments monitored Aug - Sept 2020	37,610,122	10,290.05
Hoima Total			**37,610,122**	**10,290.05**
Kasese	**24-Feb**	Payment to continuing farmers in Kasese	34,508,624	9,441.48
	10-Mar	Payment for Kasese carbon farmers	145,520,082	39,813.98
		Payments for Kasese carbon producers	2,624,817	718.14
	04-May	Payment for bounced funds for Kasese carbon farmers	16,764,148	4,586.63
	29-Jul	Kasese Yr0 farmer payments	105,303,316	28,810.76
	07-Sep	Kasese farmer payment monitored July 2020	10,042,388	2,747.58
		Kasese farmer payment, monitored July 2020	119,319,669	32,645.60
	28-Sep	Kasese farmer payment, monitored July 2020	19,455,266	5,322.92
		Kasese farmer payments, monitored July 2020	3,148,874	861.53
	10-Nov	TGB: Kasese farmer payments	30,085,950	8,231.45
		TGB: Kasese farmer payments for continuing farmers monitored in August 2020	106,800,366	29,220.35
Kasese Total			**593,573,500**	**162,400.41**
Kitagwenda	**06-Aug**	Kitagwenda Yr0 farmer payments	13,763,474	3,765.66
	23-Dec	Farmer payments for Kitagwenda & Rubirizi	96,579,918	26,424.05
Kitagwenda Total			**110,343,392**	**30,189.71**
Masindi	**21-Jul**	Year0 Masindi farmer payments monitored oct/Nov 2019	59,981,095	16,410.70
	09-Sep	Masindi farmer payments monitored Nov/Dec 2019	45,715,289	12,507.60
Masindi Total			**105,696,384**	**28,918.30**
Mbale	**05-Aug**	Mbale farmer payments monitored Nov/Dec 2020	9,692,209	2,651.77

	11-Sep	Mbale farmer payments monitored February - March 2020	10,060,348	2,752.49
Mbale Total			**19,752,557**	**5,404.26**
Mitooma	**10-Nov**	TGB: Kiyanga & Bitereko farmer payments	59,758,786	16,349.87
	23-Dec	Farmer payments for Mitooma farmers	4,125,261	1,128.66
Mitooma Total			**63,884,047**	**17,478.54**
Rubirizi	**01-Jul**	Rubirizi farmer payments	1,643,016	449.53
		TGB: Rubirizi farmer payments	26,207,968	7,170.44
	29-Jul	Rubirizi Yr0 farmer payments	39,958,472	10,932.55
	10-Nov	TGB: Rubirizi TGB farmer payments for Yr5 & Yr10	19,792,612	5,415.22
	23-Dec	Farmer payment for Yr3 farmers in Rubirizi	39,272,193	10,744.79
		Farmer payments for Kitagwenda & Rubirizi	96,153,803	26,307.47
Rubirizi Total			**223,028,064**	**61,019.99**
Grand Total			**1,153,888,066**	**315,701.25**

Table 22: Payments through seedlings suppliers in 2020

Date	District	Name	Sum of Amount (UGX)	Sum of Amount (USD)
12-Feb	**Hoima**	Bwambale Samuel	667,500	182.63
10-Mar	**Kasese**	Augustine Kiiza Kireru	14,450,000	3,953.49
		Charles Nyamutale	11,650,000	3,187.41
10-Jul	**Masindi**	Aganyira James	501,000	137.07
		Climate Alart Forest ConservationTrust	283,250	77.50
		Dauda Isingoma	327,750	89.67
		Livingstone Kabagambe	621,000	169.90
		Moses Andama	792,500	216.83
		Nyamaizi Fildah	519,000	142.00
		Wetaka Gerald	75,500	20.66
29-Jul	**Hoima**	Agaba Annet	3,948,000	1,080.16
		Kusemererwa Fred	7,749,000	2,120.11
		Mwesige Allen	4,245,500	1,161.56
19-Aug	**Hoima**	Mbabazi Justine	2,327,500	636.80
01-Sep	**Hoima**	Kaahwa Yafesi	8,560,650	2,342.18
07-Sep	**Kasese**	Kiiza Augustine Kireru	4,550,000	1,244.87
	Masindi	Charles Kisembo	3,912,650	1,070.49
		Hellen Oleru	1,302,000	356.22
		Moses Andama	3,428,250	937.96
		Wetaka Gerald	539,000	147.47
30-Sep	**Masindi**	Wabomba Wilfred	2,167,200	592.94
01-Oct	**Masindi**	Aganyira James	1,664,750	455.47
		Charles Kisembo	315,000	86.18
		Hellen Oleru	533,500	145.96
		Moses Andama	206,250	56.43

		Nyamaizi Fildah	471,000	128.86
06-Nov	**Masindi**	Aganyira James	3,395,000	928.86
		Wabomba Wilfred	752,500	205.88
		Wetaka Gerald	1,372,000	375.38
10-Nov	**Hoima & Kikuube**	Fred Kusemererwa	7,135,100	1,952.15
		Kaahwa Yafesi	3,934,000	1,076.33
	Kasese	BENECO LTD	21,300,000	5,827.63
		Charles Nyamutale	25,566,500	6,994.94
		Samson Bwambale	18,475,000	5,054.72
18-Dec	**Kasese**	Augustine Kiiza Kireru	23,635,000	6,466.48
Grand Total			**181,372,850**	**49,623.21**

NB: The USD value is based on the UGX:USD conversion average rate for 2020

5.2 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 2020, CCF has been used to replace carbon that has been lost as a result of the 130 farmers that have exited the programme. In addition, the CCF was used to support the farmers in Kasese that were affected by floods and landslides. Furthermore, grants worth USD5,500 were awarded to the four farmer groups in Rubirizi and Mitooma Districts for the initial investment in the implementation of the business plans.

6. Ongoing Community Participation

6.1 Context

Trees for Global Benefits (TGB) is a cooperative carbon offsetting scheme linking farmers in Uganda to the voluntary carbon market. Community participation in the design, implementation and governance of the project is therefore a critical element of the Programme. The project works with established community structures to engage with the participating farmers through farmer meetings. The joint challenge of COVID19 travel restrictions, social distancing and the disruption brought about by the election/campaigning season impacted on the project's ability to meet with farmers. However, the project was still able to hold a number of engagements with the project participants as detailed in this section.

6.2 Feedback

Normally, the project holds feedback meetings to discuss challenges faced by the farmers and collectively identify solutions to these challenges. However due to the COVID-19 restrictions, it was not possible to hold feedback meetings in every project site. The project relied heavily on the feedback collected from the farmers during the monitoring exercises. However, a review of the feedback from Mitooma & Rubirizi districts indicated a need to hold further discussions with the farmer leadership to identify ways of ensuring that farmers remain active even as they are nearing the end of the rotation period for the tree planting system. The meeting with the leaders agreed that the best strategy would be to develop environmentally – friendly businesses managed by the farmer groups and joint marketing ventures that would help their enterprises to start generating revenue beyond the Year 10 performance – based payments. A number of issues were raised during these feedback meetings, which are very useful for the improving the project delivery:

- **Multiple Management Objectives** should be encouraged to include a good mix of timber & non timber products to allow for a retention of trees even when the rotation period for the timber & building pole trees has been achieved. Other potential enterprises that were identified include Piggery, Zero grazing for cows & goats, Beekeeping, Avocado oil production, Fruit juice making, Pumpkin passion fruit and sunflower growing, wine making, tourism and Herbal medicine production;
- The project needs to support the farmers to access **Sustainable Markets** with interventions such as group marketing, certification etc. to guarantee that farmers benefit from their sustainable practices. A lack of market can make farmers cut down fruit trees and replace them with other enterprises with readily available markets e.g. sugarcanes; and
- Marketing requires scale and the project needs to develop **aggregation platforms** to enable the attainment of scale.

6.4 Business Development

Following the feedback from meetings with farmer leaders in Rubirizi and Mitooma Districts, TGB conducted a series of business develop workshops in which viable green businesses identified and developed into business plans. Three different workshops were held with farmers that belong to a) Kiyanga Environmental

Conservation Association, b) Bitereko Farmers Carbon Group, c) Ndangara-Nyakiyanja Tutungukye Group and d) Katanda Tree growers Association. Some of the business ideas developed by these farmers include bee keeping and nursery bed management. After development of their business plans, the pioneer TGB groups in the region received grants worth UGX 20 million per group to invest in the selected businesses through the CCF fund – which is a resilience fund that assists in preventing risk to the programme like cutting down of trees.

Figure 3: A local Bee Hive on one of the farms

6.5 Benefit – Sharing Discussions with Ten (10) Community Land Associations

Following the completion of the registration of ten Communal Land Associations as responsible bodies for the community forests in the Budongo - Bugoma Forest Range, ECOTRUST held meetings with these groups to agree on an equitable benefit sharing plan. The benefit sharing plans have further been converted into viable bankable green business plans to help enhance forest health and improve community livelihoods. These communities have been granted corporate status as the bodies responsible for the management of the community forests and developed Forest Management Plans. Once the process of acquiring land titles for the forests is completed and technical specifications developed, these groups will be ready to participate in the project. Once the carbon credits have been issued, the income from the sale of these credits will be used to manage the forests and invest in implementing the business plans. The registration of the CLAs and the development of the benefit sharing plans were made possible with funding from the Dutch Government, through the Netherlands Committee of IUCN.

6.6 Annual Stakeholders' meeting

ECOTRUST holds the Annual Stakeholders' meeting each year to acknowledge and celebrate different achievements in conservation throughout the year. This year, due to the COVID pandemic, the Annual Stakeholders' meeting was as a webinar that took place on the 21st of December 2020 dubbed "Business Development for Sustainable Forest Management" –to highlight the different programmes that ECOTRUST has undertaken throughout the year through mobilization of finances for green and inclusive business development across the different landscapes to enhance conservation, community development and restoration/maintenance of the critical wildlife corridors. The event provided a platform for updates to the different stakeholders on progress made since 2019, lessons learnt from the different implemented activities and also showcased some new innovations adopted throughout the course of the year. The event was hosted by the ECOTRUST Board members and was well attended by a national and international audience. The project was able to make arrangements for farmers to participate in the online discussion (Webinar) through various hubs hosted by our upcountry offices. Community representatives from the different project sites were presented with dummy cheques representing all their 2020 payments.

6.7 Farmer field schools

In order to improve access to capacity building, the project has adopted the establishment of farmer field schools, which are a group-based learning process in which farmers come together to share knowledge, skills and experience with less contact with the extension workers. This was meant to improve service delivery to the farmers by helping them come together and learn from model farmers by discussing their different challenges and coming up with solutions together. Nine (9) farmer field schools have been established in the reporting period; 2020 with three (3) in Miirya sub county and two (2) in Pakanyi sub county, Masindi district and four (4) have been established in Mt Elgon. The field schools occur on farms with best practices such as: *Well-maintained indigenous trees, Good root establishment, Well-lined and properly spaced pitting in the gardens.* In addition, these farms must have at least three species of indigenous trees planted in all the gardens. Some level of agroforestry being carried out by the farmers e.g., incorporation of coffee and bananas is also preferred.

6.8 Collaborative Forest Management

Following the revision of the Collaborative Forest Management (CFM) agreements to clarify, among other things, the ownership of trees and carbon planted by communities, the CFM groups in Budongo and Bugoma Central Forest Reserves have been recruited to join Trees for Global Benefit. They have now joined the 402 farmers in Rubirizi (350 farmers) and Kasese (52 farmers) that are being facilitated with carbon finance to rehabilitate degraded forest reserves. This is part of a participatory forest management process in which the community enters into a co-management arrangement with the National Forestry Authority to improve that reduce pressure on the forests, while improving community livelihoods. The CFM agreements specify the rights, responsibilities and returns for community participation in protected area management. The CFM agreements were revised with financial support from Netherlands Committee of IUCN and Uganda Biodiversity Fund.

6.9 Capacity Building for Tree Nursery Operators

During the reporting period, the project was able to offer technical assistance to the improvement of the management of six (6) community owned tree nurseries. Good quality seedlings supplied to the TGB farmers in the right quantity at the right time is key in the management of risk to the delivery of environmental services. This also involves preventing the supply of poor-quality seedlings that would deter the farmers from meeting their monitoring targets and, consequently, missing their payments. Capacity is built for the nursery operators by taking them through the tree nursery layout, hygiene, seeds sources, the different species planted by the target farmers in the respective regions, sorting, the physical appearance of the seedlings, management of the tree nursery sites, tree nursery calendar and record keeping. A total of **599,993** seedlings have been distributed in the reporting period in all the TGB project sites, all from pre-qualified nursery operators.

7. 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 23 summary of the operating Costs for the project for 2020

2020 costs	Total Cost (USD)	Carbon sales (USD)	Other sources (USD)	Providers of other sources
3rd party Verification (including quarterly & annual audits)	17,687.00	13,581.9102	4,105.09	IUCN NL
Staff time	357,561.89	236,933.09	120,628.80	IUCN NL,
Farmer capacity building	22,483.11	3,800.42	18,682.69	
Monitoring	32,630.68	24,347.29	8,283.39	
Office running costs	100,811.33	84,577.09	16,234.24	IUCN NL,
Vehicle running costs	17,145.46	4,972.44	12,173.01	
Research & Project Development	195,075.17	8,107.80	186,967.37	
Coordinators	3,300.00	3,300.00	-	
Other travel	0	0	-	
Total	**746,694.64**	**379,620.03**	**367,074.60**	

Appendix I: List of Buyers Since Project Inception

Sales prior to 2020 annual report

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	
2019	Myclimate	10000	
2019	ZeroMission	6415	
2019	COTAP	2644	
2019	Institute for Sustainable Environment (Clarkson University)	234	
2019	ZeroMission	2000	

2019	ZeroMission	3200	
2019	ZeroMission	2488	
2019	ZeroMission	3151	
2019	ZeroMission, Max Norway	3005	
2019	ZeroMission	97	
2019	ZeroMission (Max Norway)	3534	
2019	ZeroMission	164	
2019	Uganda Carbon Bureau (Jim Turbull)	11	
2019	Kampala Food Network	38	
2019	Classic Africa	51	
2019	ZeroMission	30000	
2019	ZeroMission (Max Hamburger)	80628	
2019	ZeroMission (Max Hamburger)	76995	
2019	ZeroMission (Äventyrsresor)	1679	
		1,504,668	

*Information for internal reporting only

Sales Related To 2020 Annual Report

Vintage	Name of purchaser/source of funds	Number of PVCs purchased	Price per certificate (USD)*	Total amount received (USD)*
2016	COTAP	5801		
2016	Kaffeekoop GmbH	160		
Subtotal		**5,961**		
2019	C Level	250		
2019	Myclimate	50,000		
Subtotal		**50,250**		
2020	ZeroMission Max	45,000		
2020	ZeroMission	319		
2020	ZeroMission	1740		
2020	ZeroMission	50,000		
2020	ZeroMission	3,429		
2020	ZeroMission	726		
2020	ZeroMission	1,017		
2020	Uganda Carbon Bureau (Jim Turnbull)	11		
2020	Uganda Carbon Bureau (Abi)	176		
Subtotal		**102,418**		

Grand Total	**158,629**		

*Information for internal reporting only

Unsold Stock Up-To and Including 2020 Vintage Credits

Vintage	Quantity of unsold credits
2014	18
2016	1,919
2017	2,647
2018	2,075
2019	22,632
2020 (current request)	257,787
Total Unsold Stock (PVC)	**287,078**

Total PVCs after 2020 issuance	**1,950,375**

8. **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

9. Appendix III: List of Seedling Suppliers Supported by TGB

1	Aganyira James
2	Agaba Annet
3	Bwambale Samuel (Deceased)
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

10. 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)**